

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—8.			
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Lane	Norris
Gronna	La Follette	Martine, N. J.	Vardaman
NAYS—44.			
Ashurst	James	Overman	Shields
Bankhead	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Kern	Phelan	Smith, Ga.
Broussard	Lee, Md.	Poinexter	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	Lewis	Pomerene	Stone
Cummins	Lippitt	Ransdell	Swanson
du Pont	Lodge	Reed	Taggart
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Tillman
Gallinger	Myers	Shafroth	Townsend
Hollis	Nelson	Sheppard	Walsh
Husting	Oliver	Sherman	Warren
NOT VOTING—43.			
Beckham	Dillingham	McCumber	Smoot
Borah	Fall	McLean	Sterling
Brady	Goff	Newlands	Sutherland
Bryan	Gore	O'Gorman	Thomas
Cañon	Harding	Owen	Thompson
Clapp	Hardwick	Page	Underwood
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Pittman	Wadsworth
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Saulsbury	Weeks
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Simmons	Williams
Culberson	Jones	Smith, Md.	Works
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment was rejected.

RECESS.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m., Thursday, July 20, 1916) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, July 21, 1916, at 10 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 21, 1916.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 19, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15947) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hollis	Page	Swanson
Brady	Husting	Penrose	Taggart
Brandegee	James	Ransdell	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Reed	Thompson
Clapp	Jones	Robinson	Tillman
Colt	Kenyon	Shafroth	Townsend
Culberson	La Follette	Sheppard	Underwood
Cummins	Lane	Sherman	Vardaman
Dillingham	Lippitt	Simmons	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smoot	Works
Harding	Norris	Sterling	
Hardwick	Overman	Stone	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 125, at the end of line 16, insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to sell at cost and issue lubricating oils and gasoline to vessels of the volunteer patrol squadrons duly enrolled in several naval districts; and that during maneuvers or practice drills, when any of the vessels of said patrol-boat squadrons shall be acting singly or as squadrons under the direct command or control of an officer or officers of the United States Navy, gasoline fuel shall be supplied to them free of charge.

Mr. SWANSON. I will accept that amendment for consideration in conference.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to have several communications I have received in regard to the amendment printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks on the subject.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE PATROL SQUADRON.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

New York City, July 19, 1916.

Hon. H. F. LIPPITT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the request of the governors of the Patrol Squadron, I beg to advise you that at a meeting of the organization held July 19, 1916, Mr. Guy Norman, of Newport, R. I., one of our members, suggested that a communication be directed to you for the purpose of enlisting your aid in rendering more effective the relationship now existing between the Patrol Squadron and the Navy Department. For your information I would say that the Patrol Squadron is a complete and operative organization formerly enrolled as a part of the United States naval forces for the second naval district. I am inclosing a copy of the report of Lieut. Puleston to the Navy Department, which will indicate to you the nature of the work of the squadron and its effectiveness; in addition, I am inclosing a letter from Rear Admiral A. M. Knight, formally accepting the Patrol Squadron for enrollment, as well as a copy of the by-laws of the association. I would ask you to return these documents for our files when they have had your consideration.

The purpose of this communication is respectfully to request that, if possible, a rider be added to the pending Navy bill, enabling the Patrol Squadron to receive certain material assistance from the Government in the form of fuel supplies when the squadron is in service or maneuvers. You will doubtless appreciate that this request is not unreasonable in view of the fact that the owners of these boats have gone to considerable personal expense in building the same and equipping them.

Knowing that you are naturally interested in all matters pertaining to the second naval district, which extends from Chatham, Mass., to New London, Conn., we believe that this appeal on our part for cooperation will receive your serious consideration, and to place the same in concrete form I beg to submit the following proposed amendment to the Navy bill, subject, of course, to your revision:

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to sell at cost and issue lubricating oil and gasoline to vessels of the Volunteer Patrol Squadrons duly enrolled in the several naval districts; and that during maneuvers or practice drills when any of the vessels of said patrol-boat squadrons shall be acting singly or as squadrons under the direct command or control of an officer or officers of the United States Navy, gasoline fuel shall be supplied to them free of charge.

I would also suggest, provided, of course, that it meets with your approval, that you interest Senators TILLMAN and SWANSON in this matter; doubtless these gentlemen will approve of our organization and its purpose, and will lend whatever assistance they can to further its objects. Should you desire additional information we would suggest that you get in communication with Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin D. Roosevelt, who has cooperated with us in effecting our organization.

Assuring you that any courtesy or assistance which you may give us will be deeply appreciated, I am,

Yours, faithfully,

ORSON D. MUNN,
Secretary of Patrol Squadron.

HEADQUARTERS SECOND NAVAL DISTRICT,
COMMANDANT'S OFFICE,
Newport, R. I., July 6, 1916.

From: Commandant second naval district.

To: The Secretary Patrol Squadron, 233 Broadway, New York City.

Subject: Enrollment of the Patrol Squadron in the second naval district.

Reference: (a) Your letter of June 29, 1916.

1. In accordance with your request of June 29, 1916, I have enrolled the Patrol Squadron in the second naval district.
2. To give effect to this enrollment please report in full the number of boats, officers, and men in the squadron.
3. Suitable exercises will be arranged by my aid, who has been directed to communicate with you concerning this matter.
4. I inclose herewith a copy of Lieut. Puleston's report of the exercises, which was forwarded by me to the Navy Department.
5. I believe the Patrol Squadron will be of great assistance to this district, and I assure you that I will cooperate in every way to increase its efficiency.

AUSTIN M. KNIGHT.

UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, NARRAGANSETT BAY,
COMMANDANT'S OFFICE,
Newport, R. I., June 24, 1916.

From: Lieut. W. D. Puleston, United States Navy, aid to commandant.

To: Commandant Naval Station, Narragansett Bay, R. I.

Subject: Cruise of Volunteer Squadron No. 1.

In May Lieut. Commander V. A. Kimberly requested the War College to suggest a series of exercises for Volunteer Patrol Squadron No. 1.

On May 29 a tentative list of exercises based upon the probable war-time activities of such a squadron was furnished to Lieut. Commander Kimberly.

On June 6 Lieut. R. A. Koch, the commander of the second division of the Submarine Flotilla, in reply to a request for the services of one submarine for these exercises, volunteered to cooperate with the second division the D-1, D-2, and D-3, the *Tonopah*, the *Worden*, and *Macdonough*, as this force was planning to operate in Block Island Sound during the same period of time and as he wished the submarines to operate against patrol boats and in conjunction with such boats as scouts.

A second set of problems was then drawn up, which were designed (a) to use the Patrol Squadron in a drive against submarines; (b) to use the Patrol Squadron as scouts to lead the submarines to their prey; (c) to use the Patrol Squadron to patrol the line Block Island-Gay Head for surface craft. In arranging these problems Lieut. (junior grade) R. T. Merrill, commanding U. S. S. *Tonopah*, cooperated, and his practical knowledge of the capabilities of the submarines plus a knowledge of problem solving gained through the correspondence course of the War College made his assistance of great value.

On June 10 Lieut. Commander Kimberly reported that the Patrol Squadron would arrive June 13, ready for work on June 14.

THE MOBILIZATION.

During the afternoon of June 13 the *Tonopah*, second division of Submarine Flotilla, the *Worden*, patrol boats Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, *Caddy 11*, and house boat *Daraga* arrived at Newport.

THE FIRST DAY (WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14).

At 8.30 a. m. a conference of all commanding officers was held on board the *Tonopah*, during which the whole work was briefly described, and the day's work described in detail.

In pursuance of the plan, the submarines got under way at 9 and took stations for problem.

At 10 patrol squadron No. 1, under way for problem "A," a submarine drive in the waters between Block Island and Gay Head. In this problem the patrol boats were ordered to prevent a submarine coming from the southward entering Block Island Sound or Narragansett Bay. The boats deployed on line, distance about 4 miles, and steamed about 18 knots.

Patrol boat No. 2 sighted submarine and gave signal to assemble. Three other boats quickly joined, forcing the submarine to submerge and then deployed on submarine's emergence circle. In about 15 minutes submarine emerged a second time, so near to patrol boat that she could easily have been put out of commission.

PROBLEM "A"—REPEATED.

This problem was repeated, being staged the second time in Block Island Sound. The patrol squadron was ordered to search for a submarine coming from the westward toward Newport.

Geographical conditions in this problem permitted a smaller distance between patrol boats, and they were spaced about 1½ miles apart. The submarine was discovered by No. 4, and the boats assembled very promptly, on account of the shorter distance, prepared to take up the pursuit. Problem ended.

TACTICAL EXERCISES.

The patrol squadron was then exercised in tactical maneuvers, using an improvised signal code to simplify and expedite the maneuvers.

The speed, and the perfect similarity of these boats, combined with the eagerness to learn and intelligence of the captains of the boats, made these maneuvers successful beyond any expectations.

From the start it was impressed upon the squadron that speed, speed, and more speed should be their watchword.

About 4 the squadron entered Great Salt Pond and tied up alongside *Tonopah*.

CONFERENCE.

All commanding officers assembled on the *Tonopah*, the day's work was gone over and the night work explained. Unfortunately a fog came on, preventing night work, so the evening was devoted to discussing the program for the next day.

THE SECOND DAY—THURSDAY.

At 8.30 a modification of problem "A" was begun, as follows: All patrol boats and one submarine took part. The submarine submerged and was given 10 minutes' start, at the end of which time the patrol boats took up the search.

The plan of the search was based upon the following assumptions:

(1) A submarine periscope will be sighted 1½ to 2 miles.

(2) A submarine can make 8 knots submerged.

Upon these assumptions the following plan for the search of one submarine was made. Equal search sectors were assigned to each of the five boats. The boats were to take care of their own sectors, searching in between the second and sixth mile zone, changing course to cover as much ground as their high speed would enable them, moving clockwise and at all time keeping on or near the emergence circle of the submarine.

The squadron quickly got the idea of the search and covered the ground in systematic style with the following results:

At the end of 45 minutes the submarine exposed his periscope and sighted a patrol boat near by, but heading away from submarine. Although not sighted by patrol, it was so close that submarine decided to submerge at once to avoid discovery. Exposed periscope about 15 minutes later, was again sighted by a patrol boat. Other boats assembled on submarine. Problem ended.

TACTICAL EXERCISES.

At conclusion of this exercise, held tactical exercises, and then returned to Great Salt Pond to explain problem "B."

PROBLEM "B."

Problem B explained, and at 1.30 p. m. *MacDonough* stood out to take position. At 2.30 patrol and squadron under way for problem.

At 2.45 became foggy. At 3.30 fog partly cleared and again attempted to carry out problem. At 4, while east of Old Harbor Block Island, fog again settled and was forced to return to harbor.

This was a great disappointment, as elaborate arrangements had been made for obtaining and relaying information, using the Weather Bureau station, Coast Guard stations, and Government telephone lines, and much valuable experience was expected from the proposed co-operation of these governmental agencies.

The attempt to carry out the problem gave the boats a good test of their seaworthiness, as the sea was moderate to rough, and the boats had to run dead to windward. They behaved admirably, only taking a little spray aboard.

The fog continued during the night, preventing a night patrol. All officers assembled on the *Tonopah* and talked over the next day's work.

THE THIRD DAY—FRIDAY.

CONVOY DUTY.

Problem A, modification II. The patrol squadron to protect *Tonopah* from submarines.

At 8.30 D-1 and D-3 under way for station.

At 9 *Tonopah* and patrol squadron under way. Patrol squadron ahead of *Tonopah* about 2 miles. Shortly after *Tonopah* sighted submarines and gave signal to patrol boat No. 5; forced submarine to submerge; about 15 minutes later a submarine again exposed a periscope near No. 4, and was theoretically run down.

It was impossible to tell whether one or both submarines had been accounted for, but it was apparent that neither had been able to attack *Tonopah* undisturbed.

About 11 a. m. patrol boats headed toward Block Island, the *Tonopah*, D-2, and D-3 continuing toward New London.

PROBLEM A, MODIFICATION III.

All patrol boats and D-2 assembled west of Great Salt Pond after submarine search. The submarine was given 10 minutes' start, and the first hour's search was conducted as follows:

(1) All boats deployed equally on submarines 15 minutes' circle (2 miles), then commenced retiring search at 12 knots' speed, forming a gradually widening spiral as indicated. It was planned at the end of the hour to steam around circumference of circle if submarine had not been sighted.

At the end of 45 minutes, submarine exposed periscope and was promptly sighted by patrol boat No. 2; submarine was forced to dive. Came up again in 15 minutes and was again sighted by a boat close to.

This concluded the work with submarines, and the patrol squadron headed for Newport.

THE WEATHER.

The wind and sea had been gradually increasing, and about 1 p. m. the sea was moderate to rough and wind about 4, from east to south-east. This brought the wind and sea on beam and quarter and made the boats very uncomfortable but perfectly seaworthy. No seas were shipped, only a little spray.

The carburetor on one of the boats needed adjusting, so en route to Newport a stop was made at harbor of refuge, Point Judith.

Arrived at Newport about 4 p. m. Friday.

It was the plan to hold tactical exercises in Narragansett Bay, culminating in a review by the commandant of the second naval district on Saturday morning. On account of stormy weather this was given up.

W. D. PULESTON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island is agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 175, line 10, after the word "Norfolk," insert the words "New York."

Mr. SWANSON. I will accept that amendment for consideration in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To make the amendment in order the vote by which the amendment of the committee at that point was agreed to will have to be reconsidered. Without objection, it is reconsidered; and without objection, the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee is agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to reserve the right when the bill is reported to the Senate from the Committee of the Whole to move to substitute the House for the Senate naval program.

Mr. SWANSON. That will come up on the vote upon concurring in the substitute reported from the Senate committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to vote in the affirmative on the House program.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, before voting upon the pending bill I wish to say a few words in explanation of my vote. I have not become as excited over the propositions for naval and military preparedness as have many people in our country. I have recognized the fact that the great European war and our two military expeditions into Mexico have placed the subject of war uppermost in the public mind. Not since the War of 1812 have the people of the United States considered so intently the worth of our Republic and the necessity for its preservation. World history has never been more carefully read. The awful cost and destruction of war were never before so shockingly realized. Monarchy has been compared with democracy, and every thoughtful, patriotic person has come to believe more firmly than ever that the latter is the hope of humanity. Believing this, I have felt that in the midst of a world of armies and armament it would be criminal for a Congressman, charged with the responsibility of preserving and advancing democracy and its institutions, to refuse or neglect those ordinary precautions against possible destruction which the citizen exercises for the security of his private property.

I am neither a naval nor a military expert. I would be unable to determine wisely the exact necessary size of an army and navy to meet the requirements of national protection and defense which I believe should be demanded. But I think I know what ought to be accomplished, and I am clear in my own mind what should be our first, what our second, and what our third lines of defense, and their importance is in the order I have mentioned. The Navy should be strong enough to prevent the landing of a transoceanic army upon our shores; it should contain every submarine and aerial device necessary to hold a foreign fleet at a sufficient distance at sea to prevent any reasonably possible explosive from blowing up our seacoast cities. For this purpose I am willing to vote every dollar needed; I wish I could know that I was voting no more. The Navy is composed of expensive machines, requiring comparatively few men, and if our country is to fight for its defense, which I hope it will never be obliged to do, I want that fighting done with machines rather than by men. I prefer to sacrifice dollars rather than human life in war.

It is my judgment that this Senate bill is top-heavy. I should have provided for fewer dreadnaughts and more colliers and reserved more for diving and flying machines. But if we are to err on the side of extravagance, I am willing that error shall be committed in the naval program, for with a reasonably strong, well-balanced Navy we would have little use for any other defense.

Our second line should be our seacoast defense. This should fortify our large and vulnerable cities and should contain guns of the longest range and the most destructive power known to modern genius. Fighting in forts and from behind fortifications is most effective against an approaching enemy, and at the same time the risk to soldiers' lives from behind these fortifications is less than it is in the open field.

Our third line of defense is the Army, and I would be content with a reasonably small, well-equipped, well-trained, and well-paid standing army, and especially would I be satisfied with such an army if all of our men, rich and poor, of military age were trained in the art and science of personal and national defense. We need an Army, not so much to protect against invasion from across the sea, but to protect our border against Mexican invasion while we continue our blundering bluffing with that country, to whose destruction we have contributed not a little. With a sufficient Navy and proper coast defenses we will never have need for a great Army.

And so, Mr. President, while I believe that the Executive and Congress are unduly excited and are seeing things which do not exist, yet do I believe that this country, whose glorious destiny means so much to humanity, should be at all times prepared against any reasonably possible attack from a foreign foe, and I would rather at this time err on the side of financial extravagance than on the side of dangerous parsimony.

I have not been impressed with the argument—or statement, rather—that our preparedness program has been largely induced by munition and war ordnance makers. I can not believe that these men want war any more than I can believe that publishers, farmers, laborers, and manufacturers generally, all of whom have profited on account of the present European conflict, want war because of individual or corporate profit to them. I have more faith in the patriotism of our people.

I voted to strike from the bill the provision for an \$11,000,000 Government armor plant. I have no doubt that the Government in the past has paid more for armor plate than it ought to have paid, but that was the fault of the Government and not that of the manufacturers. They obtained what they could get, which, however, was less than any other nation in the world was paying. I am wondering, however, if any of the gentlemen who are complaining at the large prices received by the plate makers would have sold to the Government anything which they might have had, which the Government in time of peace wanted, at less than the same product was sold elsewhere? Why, the Government asked for bids from the three armor-plate factories, and for several years the bids were different, but in awarding the contracts the company bidding the least got no greater part of the award than did the company making the highest bid. Is there any wonder that soon all bids were the same? Of course I understand that the Government wanted all three plants to continue in business, hence the division of the award between them. But whatever happened in the past that was wrong has been corrected, and at a time when the Government is spending millions on preparedness I feel that we should not impose an additional tax upon the people with no idea of getting armor plate cheaper, indeed with the admitted fact that the Government will pay more. But, sir, I have faith in the arbitration clause in this bill. After the present war is over I hope that an international peace tribunal will be established and that an armor plant and extensive armament will not thereafter be needed; and it is admitted that the proposed Government plant can not be constructed in three years. We had an opportunity to save at least \$11,000,000 and to obtain armor plate at less than it can possibly be made by the Government. I would cut from this bill six of the battleships and the armor-plate provision and thus save \$120,000,000 to the people—a tidy sum, which should not be ignored. I believe our naval strength would be sufficient, and in a few years—perhaps in a year—we will know more what is best to do. To drop the six battleships this year would not necessarily weaken or retard efficient naval preparation.

Neither the Army nor Navy bill is just what I would like, but so sure am I that our great country is not properly prepared to defend the priceless institutions of democracy that I shall vote for the pending bill as the best and perhaps the least that can be obtained at this time.

Mr. President, when the battleship proposition was adopted I was at a conference committee meeting, and not having an opportunity then I propose, when the bill reaches the Senate, to move to strike out the provision for 10 battleships and substitute 4 for 10. Four are more than can be completed or even begun within a year, and in 12 months we may be wiser from experience and may know better what the Navy needs. I will not, however, delay the committee longer at this time.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I fully realize how unpopular it is to oppose the pending measure. I also realize how unavailing it is to oppose the bill.

I can not agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Townsend], who has just taken his seat, that this great appropriation of the people's money, the large amount which we are now about to appropriate for preparedness on such a huge scale, is a guarantee of peace. It may not bring war, but certainly no student of history will claim that any government, no matter how well it may be prepared, can give a guarantee of peace. I am not against reasonable appropriations for preparedness. This Government has ever since it was established appropriated large sums of money for the Navy and has appropriated reasonable sums for the Army.

Mr. President, I have believed that we were a democracy, but we are about to enter upon a policy which, in my judgment, will be a policy for a military establishment; and a military government means an aristocracy, an autocracy, and not a democracy. I believe that no patriotic American citizen will favor any policy that ultimately will lead to a military form of government.

Apparently this bill appropriates \$315,000,000 or \$316,000,000, but it authorizes more than twice that amount, and before the scheme is completed it will mean the expenditure of more than a billion dollars. I receive every day from some of my constituents protests against the so-called revenue bill. I introduced day before yesterday a number of telegrams from some of the bankers in my State protesting against the tax on banks. Mr. President, who is to pay this enormous tax, which must necessarily be raised in order to pay for this preparedness scheme? We are all in favor of preparedness, but not to the extent that it shall be burdensome to our people. We have heard about the patriotic men who marched in the streets at Chicago and other places in the great preparedness parades, but I have also heard it suggested that some of those very men shied at a recruiting station. Those who march in a preparedness parade are not always the first who are willing to sacrifice their lives in defense of the Nation.

When you say to me that it is the men of means who shall pay for this preparedness scheme, I say to you you are mistaken. It is the rank and file of the American people who will pay this tax. Wages must be diminished and the cost of living will be increased. Those who are engaged in business are entitled to a reasonable return on their investment; they will get that return, but it will be saddled upon the bended backs of the toiling millions of the Nation.

Mr. President, let us dismiss the thought that there are any sinister influences or any unworthy motives back of this great preparedness scheme; and yet it is evident to me that it is a mistaken idea at this time, when the people of the European nations will in a short time lie prostrate, when they will have exhausted their money and their men, for us to enter on this scheme, involving such enormous appropriations. Why should we at such a time go into this extravagance and saddle upon the American people an expense which is wholly unnecessary and which is dangerous to a republican form of government?

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to go further into this subject. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette] has shown to the Senate that it is unnecessary, that it is unwise, that it is dangerous for this Nation to embark upon a policy of this kind. I agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, that it is wholly unnecessary to go into this extravagance.

There are items in this bill which, standing alone, I could support. The item for a Government armor plant I voted for, and I voted against striking it from the bill. I do not say that I believe in Government ownership as a rule, but I do believe in a business like this, whose only object is the manufacture of armor plate and the building of battleships for the purpose of destroying the human race, that it is a function of government not only to build ships and manufacture armor plate, but also to manufacture munitions of war.

You say to me that it would be cheaper to let private capital continue in this business. So far as that is concerned, Mr. President, I care not for the expense in supplying armor plate for the ships actually needed. It is the motive back of this whole scheme that I am opposed to. It is a mistaken policy, and the result will be that at the beginning of every Congress

we shall have in the lobbies here and elsewhere men demanding special legislation for fear that there is going to be a war. If the United States were to manufacture its own armor plate and its own munitions of war, there would be no incentive for these men to demand legislation that would give them the increased business.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator from North Dakota pardon an inquiry?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I think the Senator will agree that if the Government had its own armor-plate plant and private greed had been eliminated from the propaganda behind this bill we should have provided for fewer battleships.

Mr. GRONNA. I think that is true, Mr. President.

Mr. CLAPP. Then, regardless of what a ton of armor plate might cost, if economy were the key word, we could save the price of this proposed plant by simply eliminating even one of the proposed battleships, the presence of which is undoubtedly due—and that without any reflection upon anyone—to the propaganda inspired in this case.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I intended to say that; and I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for the suggestion.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be understood as opposing every item contained in this bill, for that is not the case; but I believe that it is wholly unnecessary at this time to enter upon this elaborate program, involving the appropriation of the large sums of money carried by this bill and involving also the expenditure of thousands of millions before we are through. As I have already said, not only is the bill objectionable because of the large amount of money appropriated, but it is objectionable because it embarks the Government upon a policy which, in my judgment, is dangerous to the institutions of our country. The people who have settled on American soil have come here for the purpose of living under a Government which shall be a pure democracy. We can not maintain a pure democracy and at the same time enter upon a policy of militarism—and that is what this scheme means.

I attribute no dishonorable motive to any man who has been back of the preparedness campaign; but, sir, it has made my blood boil when I have seen some of the exhibitions which have been made, for instance, the picture shows in which have been depicted some of the great cities upon our coast toppling under the attacks of foreign enemies. Some of these exhibitions have been an insult to every American citizen of foreign descent.

I challenge contradiction now of the statement that the foreign-born citizen has been as loyal to the flag as any of those who were born on American soil. Sir, you need only to go to Lafayette Square in this city and look at the statue of Von Steuben in the northwest corner of that park; the statue in the northeast corner of Kosciuszko, born in Poland; and the other two statues decorating that park—the statues of Lafayette and Rochambeau, both born in France—to realize what foreigners have done for America. Can you show me generals and soldiers of more valor or more worth to the American Union than were those men in whose memory statues have been erected by a grateful people? Go over to Franklin Square, and there you will find the statue of Commodore Barry, an Irishman. Mr. President, this preparedness propaganda, carried on by certain people for certain purposes, is in many of its aspects discrediting to citizens of this country whose ancestors came from foreign shores.

Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for speaking of myself, my parents were not born in this land; but, sir, I have to-day two sons, young though they be, who stand ready at any moment to sacrifice their lives for the perpetuation of this Government and the defense of the flag. One of them has answered to the call of the Government, and is now a private in the ranks of the Army. Sir, I am not so old myself but that I can go to the front, and I am willing at any moment to join the ranks as a private in defense of the flag of the United States. So we will find hundreds of thousands of young men of foreign birth who have enlisted in the Army at their country's call. When I was home in North Dakota in the month of May there was dedicated a statue, erected over the grave of a soldier, a poor boy who came here from Norway, who had only taken out his first papers, but during the Spanish-American War he said, "I want to go to the front and defend the American flag, because America is going to be my home." He sacrificed his life in defense of this country. Would it be possible for an American-born citizen to do more?

Go to the cemetery at Gettysburg and see the hundreds of graves with little monuments or headstones over them bearing Norwegian or Scandinavian names. The soldiers who lie there

fought in the Civil War, as some of their brothers fought, even, in the Revolutionary War. I do not believe there is a single citizen of the United States of foreign extraction who would not fight to-day in any war against any nation on earth in order to defend the American flag.

Mr. President, I can not vote for this bill. I should like to vote for a bill providing for the authorization of, say, four battleships and an equal number of battle cruisers, and providing for a certain number of submarines, and the construction or appropriation for two battleships now; but I believe I can foresee that in a decade or two the war vessels constructed under the immense sum of money we are appropriating to-day, and under the authorizations we are making to-day, will simply be thrown upon the scrap heap.

I do not believe that anyone fears that any nation on earth will invade this country; but some one will make huge profits from this enterprise. That we all know. I have no objection to anyone in legitimate business making profits. I believe that legitimate business should be profitable; but I do object to a policy to which the American people, I believe, are opposed; and I believe, sir, that in the near future—in the course of a few years—this bill and this scheme will not be as popular as it is to-day.

I do not claim to be any more patriotic than anyone else, but I want to be allowed the same opportunity of voting against this bill as those who favor it have in voting for it. If I oppose it, it is not because I lack in patriotism or in loyalty to my country, but it is because my vision is not that of other men and my judgment differs from theirs. I believe, sir, that it is little less than criminal unnecessarily to saddle a burden like this upon the bended backs of the American people. The people have not asked for it. They will not indorse it when they understand what it means.

Mr. President, I perhaps should have remained silent and not have said a single word had it not been that it is manifestly apparent that this measure is so popular that it will be passed without even a record vote, and I wanted to take the opportunity of recording my opposition to the bill.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, before finally voting upon this matter I want to submit just a word or two. I shall be very brief.

I would very gladly support the House bill, and, realizing that in legislation we can not always secure that which we desire, I would even vote to add a reasonable number of battleships to the House bill. But when it comes to adding 10 great, heavily armored battleships, in the light of the experience of this war, which has shown very conclusively that there is at least a grave doubt as to the final efficiency of such ships, and when it comes to adding this burden of over three hundred million to the already overtaxed American people's burden in a time of profound peace with our Republic—unless we can call the attempt to bring to justice some bandits in Mexico war—I can not bring myself to support the Senate bill.

I want to point out one strange inconsistency in this bill. It has always been a theory of mine that whatever we do we ought to do it openly and aboveboard and with candor. In this bill, in a time of profound peace, when the great nations of the earth are daily weakening and crippling themselves in the awful war that is prevailing, we suddenly propose practically to double the appropriations of last year, and to embark upon the most extraordinary program ever seriously considered by an American Congress; and coincidentally with that we insert in the closing part of the bill a provision that when the war is over the President shall use his good offices in the effort at an arbitration that shall be designed, not to result in disarming—because no nation will ever disarm—but in lessening this mad increase, in staying this made race of militarism that is destined to stop only when bankruptcy on the part of some nations prevents their keeping pace with our pace; and incorporated in that proposition is the solemn declaration of the Senate that we view with apprehension and disfavor the general increase of armament among the nations of the earth.

I have heard Senators stand upon the floor of this Chamber and proclaim that this Republic was losing the respect of other nations. Sir, I know of nothing more calculated to bring distrust than for this Republic suddenly, and without any excuse being given for it, to embark upon this extraordinary program, and at the same time to say to the world that we view with apprehension and disfavor the general enlargement of armament.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. CLAPP. I yield to the Senator with pleasure.

Mr. NORRIS. Is not the Senator aware that the statement that we are building this great Navy as a matter of securing

peace is something that has always been common? Does not the Senator know that every battleship that England owns, and every battleship that Germany owns and that France owns and that Italy owns and that Russia owns, has been built to preserve peace; and that every cannon that has been made for the purpose of engaging in this war, and all the ammunition that has been made, and all the preparation that has ever been made by any of those nations, was made for the purpose of retaining the peace of the world? And why should not we continue to retain the peace of the world?

Mr. CLAPP. No, Mr. President; the Senator is not aware of that. The Senator is aware, however, that every battleship that has been added by every nation on earth has been proclaimed a method of securing peace, but I had not supposed such declarations were taken seriously.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator see how successful they have been?

Mr. CLAPP. But the Senator knows, and every Senator in this Chamber knows, and every man, woman, and child knows, that no man ever shot another unless he had a weapon with which to shoot.

Of course it has been a travesty for nations to prepare to go to war and at the same time to proclaim that they were doing it to maintain peace. If that required any proof, the present war furnishes sufficient proof. And now we reach the final climax of that travesty by taking a position that will force every nation on earth, if they can sell enough bonds to accomplish the purpose, to build more ships to meet our ships, and at the same time proclaim that we view with apprehension and disfavor the general increase of the armaments of the earth.

Mr. President, this finds a parallel only, as I recall now, in an incident that once occurred in the Legislature of Wisconsin. In justice to the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I want to say that the burlesque was enacted before he became a factor in the forces of that great State. The Legislature of Wisconsin at one session practically repealed the law against houses of ill fame and practically repealed the law against selling liquor to minors. It practically opened the door to houses of prostitution, and at the same time opened the door to the sale of liquor to minors. But, Senators, that legislature was not without a moral conscience; it was not without a capacity to recognize the duty it owed to humanity; and it concluded that travesty of practically taking away the penalty for keeping houses of ill fame and for selling liquor to minors by making an appeal to Congress to abolish polygamy in far-off Utah.

I think that absurdity finds a parallel when we take a step that we know will force every nation on earth to build more battleships, because surely when the nations of the earth see us reaching out, as we have in the past, for overseas territory, the thought, the suggestion, the claim that we are building these ships for peace and defense will not receive even a respectful hearing. When we take a step that we absolutely know will force every nation on earth that can sell enough bonds to accomplish it to build more battleships, for us solemnly to make this declaration that we view with apprehension and disfavor the general increase of armaments on the heels of this enactment providing for 10 new battleships in addition to the 2 that have already been authorized, and the construction of which has not been begun, is something that will be received with a sneer and a smile of derision throughout the world and will force the other nations to retaliate in additional preparation.

Now, let us be honest. If we are going to force the nations of the earth to build additional fleets, why should we put in this bill a declaration at absolute variance with the recognized purpose and logical effect of the act itself?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, in view of the data submitted by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. TILLMAN] in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and to which, of course, I have no objection—I feel it my duty to make the request to have this statement of the Bethlehem Steel Co., largely bearing on what the chairman has inserted in the Record, printed as a public document. I hope the chairman will have no objection to that request.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have no objection whatever, sir.

Mr. PENROSE. I make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is this the proper time to make a reservation or give notice of a desire to have a separate vote upon a committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any time is the proper time to make that reservation.

Mr. CUMMINS. This is the proper time, then?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not sure whether the notice given by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is definite enough; and in order to make that certain I desire to reserve for a separate vote in the Senate the committee amendment beginning at line 1, on page 170, and ending with line 5, on page 174, and, further, the committee amendment beginning at line 9, on page 175, and closing with line 12, on page 176.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to say to the Senator from Iowa that the Chair thinks what the Senator from Iowa desires to move to reserve a separate vote on is the motion to strike out and insert. It takes in page 167 as well.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is the Senate committee amendment relating to the construction of the Navy.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to reserve—I think the Senator from Iowa has done it, if I understand his reservation—I want to give notice that I will ask for a separate vote upon the Senate amendment that provides for the increase of the Navy.

Mr. CUMMINS. A further parliamentary inquiry, because I do not know much about such things. When the motion to substitute or to strike out and insert is before the Senate, will a motion to amend either the part that is sought to be stricken out or the part that is sought to be inserted be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There have been so many private inquiries and so many statements made on the floor of the Senate with reference to what would be proposed to be done that the Chair thinks it is the proper time now to express an opinion as to what can be done.

For instance, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] served notice that he would move to substitute the House bill. The Chair does not believe that any such motion as that would be in order. The House bill is preserved by disagreeing to the Senate amendments, which leaves the House bill in force, and there is not any necessity for any such motion. If the Senate refuses to concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, the House bill is then before the Senate.

Second, the Chair believes that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has done what he has a right to do. He has reserved the question which consists of a motion to strike out and to insert.

Third, that amendment having been reserved for a separate vote, the Chair has no doubt that in the Senate the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted are each subject to amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, may I inquire, if the Senate should concur in certain of the Senate amendments to the House bill and refuse to concur in others, whether under those circumstances it would not be in order to move to substitute the House bill for such bill as the Senate might have agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the present opinion that if certain amendments are concurred in and other amendments are not concurred in by the Senate, then the House bill might be offered as a substitute for the amended bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, one further inquiry. I do not know that the Chair will care to express an opinion upon this question, but it so frequently occurs that I should like, if possible, to settle it in my own mind, at least.

With relation to the inquiry of the Senator from Iowa and the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska as to the necessity for giving notice, when a bill is in Committee of the Whole, that they will demand a separate vote in the Senate when the question comes up as to concurring in the Senate amendments I had not thought it was necessary to give any notice whatever; that when the bill got to the Senate the question was on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, and if there was no objection they were usually concurred in en bloc, but any Senator could demand a separate vote before the question was put, without having given any previous notice. I know of no rule that requires a Senator to give notice in Committee of the Whole about what he is going to do when the bill gets to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no such rule, and there is but one precedent. That precedent, however, is against the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] simply desires a vote on the building program of the House and Senate. That is what he reserves, and that has been reserved by four or five Senators. As I understand, there is no other question of contention now except as to the building or construction program in the two bills.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has stated my position precisely. I want to vote for the House program. I am unable to vote for the Senate program. But I

accept the ruling of the Chair as just announced, and I expect to abide by it. Some of the rules of the Senate, according to my experience, Mr. President, are like the human anatomy, fearfully and wonderfully made. I have long since given up all hope of being able to acquire an adequate comprehension of them either in detail or in their entirety. I can not keep abreast of their construction. The vote I cast will be due to the fact that the House program is the result of very careful and mature preparation based on long and exhaustive hearings, representing, therefore, the thought of the committee which devoted itself to that subject for a long period of time.

I do not believe, as was most eloquently asserted yesterday by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], that there is now or is liable to be at any time the need for such a huge addition to our Navy. There is a need for some addition; a need which is emphasized by the recent blacklisting of many of the merchants and mercantile corporations of this country by the British Government; a course of action which in view of the widespread sympathy in this country for the allies, coming at this time, is most unwise and wholly inexplicable.

I can not conceive of a more unjust and outrageous action than that involved in the recent official announcement that certain citizens of the United States shall not be permitted to traffic with the subjects of Great Britain and per consequence with the people of any other nation. Great Britain controls the sea. Our citizens have the same right to trade with the enemies of Great Britain that they have to trade with the subjects of Great Britain or between themselves. While I do not believe that there is at present any prospect of hostilities or conflict between this country and any other, I feel that this administration will resent this preposterous embargo upon our merchants and resort to every expedient within its power, even to reprisals if necessary. It should do it, and meet this assault upon the rights and prerogatives of our own citizens with firmness, with courage, and with success.

I think, therefore, a well-balanced fleet, thoroughly equipped and capable of enforcing such rights as these, is one of the essentials of modern commerce and of modern civilization, and the House program furnishes an adequate expansion in addition to the present force of the Navy for that and all other emergencies which may confront this and succeeding administrations.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. THOMAS. I am through. I did not intend to occupy the time of the Senate as long as I have done.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Suppose we should not be able to adjust the matter to which the Senator has referred amicably, does he think that the bill as passed by the House would be sufficient to meet the situation that may present itself?

Mr. THOMAS. We can meet it with our present Navy. I think with the addition provided by the bill as passed by the House we are in a position to meet any situation. If the Senator heard the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin yesterday, he could not escape the conclusion that we have to-day the second navy in the world and have had for years, but the fact, instead of being made public, has been suppressed by the journals of the country.

Mr. BORAH. I have formed my own opinion upon that from other sources.

Mr. THOMAS. This is from official sources.

Mr. BORAH. I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the Senator has a right to do that.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator think now that we have a sufficient Navy to meet the kind of situation which would be presented if we could not arrange it through diplomatic channels?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir; I do most emphatically.

Mr. BORAH. Then, there is no need of going further.

Mr. THOMAS. Not for present emergencies or any that can arise during the European war.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has secured the privilege of placing in the RECORD what I think we all agree as the baldest advertisement in the way of a public document, the pamphlet of the Bethlehem Steel Co., it seems to me that it is but fitting and proper that the antidote should go with the poison. This Bethlehem Steel Co. is making money beyond the dreams of man. I want to read this, to show how this corpora-

tion is fattening and how unnecessary it is to advertise. I cut this from the Baltimore Sun:

IN FIELD OF FINANCE—BETHELEHEM STEEL EARNINGS FOR THIS YEAR MAY EXCEED \$60,000,000, IT IS ESTIMATED.

The directors of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation met yesterday in New York. Based upon the showing of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation in first half of the current year, the estimate of \$60,000,000 earnings for the full year 1916 will no doubt be realized. While no official periodical statements of earnings are issued by the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, it is believed they were around \$30,000,000 in the first half. The Bethlehem Co. has sufficient war business on its books to keep its ordnance plants in operation to the end of the year, and as earnings in June are understood to have established a new high record, profits of \$60,000,000 or over for 1916 seem to be assured. Bethlehem is now shipping 1,000,000 shells a month, or at the rate of more than 30,000 a day.

It is necessary that they should be advertised in a public document at the expense of the people.

The Pennsylvania Steel Co. had been absorbed by the Bethlehem, and there will be no financing in connection with the transaction. The railroads which owned practically all the stock of the Pennsylvania Steel Co. have taken bonds in payment for their shares. The transaction will necessitate no capital readjustment.

The question of increasing the capital stock of the Bethlehem Steel Co. is not a leading one with the Bethlehem Co. at present. No change is now being considered. Neither is any change in the rate of dividend on Bethlehem Steel contemplated in the near future. The Bethlehem Steel Corporation will spend between \$12,000,000 and \$15,000,000 this year for new construction.

They must expect the war to go on:

As the surplus available for the common stock or new construction is expected to run far above \$300 a share this year, there will be plenty of cash left for extra distributions to shareholders if the directors deem such action advisable.

Mr. President, it seems to me with the knowledge before the country of the profits of this corporation to foist into the RECORD a document published as a public document at public expense, but which is nothing but a bald advertisement, is a wrong almost to a crime.

I wish what I have read to be published as an antidote to the poison, and I hope it will follow right along.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate. I only want to suggest an antidote to the poison of the Senator from New Jersey.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. in my recollection has never paid a dividend. I do not know what it may have done in the early days. It is indeed very fortunate that these war profits have come to it. It has for many years been one of the two or three strictly ordnance manufacturing concerns in the United States and it was following its legitimate business and its special aptitudes in taking these contracts.

Had it not been for the war in my opinion the Bethlehem Steel Co. would be absolutely closed to-day under the operation of the present Democratic tariff laws. When I visited the Bethlehem Steel Co. in 1914 when I was a candidate for reelection the plant was pretty nearly shut up. Instead of having twenty or thirty thousand men employed at good wages there were two or three thousand employed in the works and they did not know how long they would remain there. Meanwhile the fixed charges were going on and the general expenses, with no profits in sight. Probably bankruptcy would have been the fate of the Bethlehem Steel Co. had it not been for the war in Europe. In this instance as in a number of other instances the chief asset of the Democratic Party is in the war in Europe.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I want to say that during the time the Senator said they were not paying interest they were paying interest on the bonds. Of course they had such an eternal quantity of water that it was almost an impossibility to pay interest on the water. But the Senator says that when he ran for office up there they were idle. That was the ill effect of the Republican administration. But now under the Democratic administration he admits with his own lips that they are all busy and making money. But they are making money out of the process of killing humanity, and I would to God that no profit would come to the country through this uncanny and iniquitous system.

But you can not get away from the fact that the Bethlehem Steel Co. has robbed and wronged the American people in the manufacture of its armor plate, charging the Government prices far beyond those at which they sold it in foreign countries, and of a poorer character as well. History is full of the wrongs of the Bethlehem Steel Co., and to resuscitate, revive, and try to hold it up here by foisting a bald advertisement in the public record, paid for at public expense, is, I should think, too small a thing for the splendid Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was obliged to be out of the Chamber a portion of the morning. I rise to inquire if during my absence the Senator from Pennsylvania obtained unanimous

consent to print as a public document the Bethlehem Steel Co. book?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has.

Mr. REED. That I objected to yesterday morning?

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will permit me, I made a request for unanimous consent and obtained it with the particular assent of the chairman of the Naval Committee. In view of the fact that the chairman of the Naval Committee had had inserted in the RECORD a large correspondence and a great deal of data bearing on this question of a hostile nature to the proposition which I have argued here in the Senate, I only thought it would contribute further to the enlightenment of the Senate to present the other side of the case. The chairman of the committee very generously and properly agreed to my suggestion. I had not intended to press the matter again had it not been that my attention was called this morning to the very large amount of data which had been inserted in the RECORD by the chairman of the Naval Committee, to which, of course, I had no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the document in question is not asked to be printed as a public document for the purpose of informing the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania well knows that to be the fact.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit me? As I understand it, a public document is not confined to the purpose of informing the Senate; it is meant for the purpose of informing the public.

Mr. REED. I was about to say, and did succeed in saying, that this document is not printed as a public document for the purpose of informing the Senate, because it has already been circulated among the Members of the Senate and is now in their possession. I now add what I was about to say when interrupted, that it is not being printed as a public document for the purpose of informing the public in the sense that ordinary documents are printed, because it is already privately printed in a large edition, so that it can be circulated amongst all those persons who are at present specially studying the question of a Government armor plant versus a private armor plant. It is in fact being printed as a public document in order that it may be sent out with the implied sanction of the Senate of the United States, that the bill for the printing of this propaganda issued by a private corporation shall be paid out of the Public Treasury, and to the further end that it may have the franking privilege and be scattered broadcast over the land as a Senate document printed at the public expense and sent out by the Senate for the public information. It is a shameless proposition.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I understood him to say that he objected to its publication yesterday.

Mr. REED. I did.

Mr. KENYON. Then was unanimous consent obtained today in the absence of the Senator?

Mr. REED. It was. I was in the cloakroom engaged in some conferences with Senators about the business of the Senate when I learned the fact that a unanimous-consent agreement to print the document had been made.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. When was the order issued? Has that been done to-day?

Mr. REED. Apparently it has been done in the last few minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. I inquired of a Senator sitting next to me if he knew about it, and he did not; and I do not remember hearing it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Surely the Senator will not question the fact that the matter was ordered printed?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not question it. I inquired for information.

Mr. GALLINGER. The matter was presented in the usual form, and it was heard.

Mr. PENROSE. The stenographer heard it, and it will appear in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no doubt about that being the fact. The present occupant of the chair was not aware of what occurred yesterday, for he was not here in the afternoon. The Senator from Pennsylvania rose and asked to make it a public document, and the Senator from South Carolina, as chairman of the Naval Committee, said it was all right. Everybody heard it or should have heard it, and it was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, any document which is printed at public expense and sent out as a public document ought to be

one furnishing reliable and sound information. It ought not to be an ex-parte statement made by a party in interest. It ought not to partake of the nature of an advertisement of a private concern at the public expense. It is about time the Senate begins to exercise a little discretion in regard to the use of the public money in this manner.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask my colleague who made the request yesterday to have this book printed as a public document.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]; and I objected.

A few days ago, or a little while back, a document was offered here and ordered printed; nobody examined it, and it has been used extensively by the mail-order houses of this country as an advertisement of the mail-order business, the mail-order houses thus getting the benefit of the franking privilege. These highly patriotic institutions that now undertake to avoid the payment of their just share of the public revenue by shipping their pamphlets and their catalogues by freight until they get within the bounds of a particular zone, so that by mailing them within that zone they can save a few cents which otherwise they would have to pay to the Government, have now improved upon that method and are able to employ the franking privilege on at least this one document. There was much matter in that document which did pertain to the public business, and so there was some excuse for printing it, though I think a very poor excuse; but this thing that we are asked to mulct the Government to the extent of I know not how many thousands of dollars to print and to circulate is a mere false and misleading ex-parte statement made by a concern that has been coldly and deliberately robbing the Government of the United States for years. The evidence that it has been robbing the Government of the United States is found within the four corners of the document, although the casual reader might not discover the fact. On yesterday, however, one of the Senators read some excerpts from this book. I shall find them and, with the consent of the Senate, insert them at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART] read the following excerpts from the document now under discussion:

"We will manufacture one-third, or such additional quantity as may be awarded to us of the armor plate required for the contemplated five-year naval program, estimated at approximately 120,000 tons, at a price of \$395 for side armor, as compared with the price of \$425 now obtained.

"The proposed price is lower than has been paid by the Government for more than 10 years.

"Steel prices are continually going up, and they are to-day much higher than has been the case for many years. In spite of that, we offer to build armor at a lower price than the United States Government has paid for 29 years, and we agree to accept this lower price for the next five years."

Mr. REED. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] asked unanimous consent that the document read from, being the same document now under consideration, be printed as a public document. Whereupon the following proceedings were held:

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not know whether the Senator's objection is well taken or not. I conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs regarding this matter, and he said he would be very glad to have it printed. Certainly there can be no objection to the dissemination of information, particularly when the request is made by the defeated party.

Mr. REED. I have not any doubt that it would be very desirable on the part of this concern to have its brief and argument printed at the expense of the Government and distributed under the franking privilege. I am not sure that I understand the Senator's request. Do I understand that he asks unanimous consent that it may be printed as a public document, provided the Committee on Printing should give its O. K.?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. I object. If the Bethlehem Steel Co. wants to print its defense or its argument, let it do it out of some of the profits it has made charging the Government prices for 29 years which it now says it is ready to cut to a very large degree, although it also says that the cost of manufacture to-day is greater than it ever has been in the history of the country—a plain, bald confession that it has been despoiling and robbing this Government for the past 29 years.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, of course I can reserve the right to read this as part of my remarks.

Mr. REED. Unquestionably, Mr. President, the Senator can read it. So can a man read the advertising literature of any company; but I hardly think the Senator from Pennsylvania would impose that upon the Senate; and if so, we may have to have a night session to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I am the best judge of the propriety of the matters that I choose to bring before this body. This is not an advertisement in any way. It is a discussion of a public question; and

I intend to bring up this request at a little later hour, when the armor-plate matter comes properly before the Senate. I will withdraw it for the present.

Of course, in view of my objection the request could not be granted, and the document could not be printed as a public document unless the Senate should thereafter take a different course which, it appears, has been done.

I specifically call the attention of the Senate to the quotations from the book which were read by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART].

One of those declarations was that the Bethlehem Steel Co. was now prepared to make a binding contract with the Government for the next five years to sell and deliver to it, if I remember the figures aright, the armor plate which it might want for some \$30 a ton less than it had been charging. In connection with that statement is another that the price named is less than has ever been charged to the Government in 29 years. In connection with the two statements is a third statement, that the price of labor and the price of all material entering into armor plate are higher now than they have been for 29 years. The effect, therefore, of the statement is that although armor-plate material is higher than it has been in 29 years, that labor is higher than it has been in 29 years, and that the cost of production is greater than it has been in 29 years, this concern can afford to deliver, and will deliver, to the Government armor plate for \$30 a ton less than it has at any time during the past 29 years exacted from us. That is an absolute admission that for 29 years it has robbed the Government, whose flag floats over it and whose armies and navies protect it. Now that concern comes here, and the Senate grants unanimous consent to print its propaganda and advertisement and to send it through the mails without charge.

Nor is that all of the loathsome and sickening story. It is an evidence that this company has been selling its armor plate to foreign governments to put upon the sides of their ships and to protect their guns for less than it has been charging this Government, that gives it protection. It has been willing for less of dollars to furnish to a government or to governments that may at any time become our enemies armor for ships of war for less money than it charges us, thus enabling those governments to build their navies at less cost, and consequently, for the same amount of dollars, to build greater navies than ours, navies that may in the mutations of national life at any moment thunder with their guns against the coast cities of the United States. And it is proposed that such a concern can have the franking privilege, so that it can flood this country—probably through the Republican national committee—with a document that looks like a Senate document; that looks like it had come with the sanction of the Senate; so that it can flood this country with its ex parte, its false, its misleading statements without the payment of a penny of postage!

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. OLIVER. I challenge the Senator from Missouri to find a single false statement in that document. He can not do it.

Mr. REED. Well, I say to the gentleman who is a stockholder, and who has admitted he is a stockholder, in institutions that are engaged in making armor plate, who stands here on the floor of the Senate advocating the cause of those things in which he is financially interested, and who, if, he were the judge of a court would be barred from sitting in a case involving the question of dollars and cents to the concern in which he is interested, but who, nevertheless, has the cold effrontery to stand here advocating and voting for that which will put money in his pocket—I say that the entire document is false and misleading—that is, it is undertaken in this document to demonstrate that the Bethlehem Steel Co. has dealt fairly with the United States—the facts are otherwise—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. That it is a patriotic institution—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. The facts are otherwise.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. That it has been inclined to treat the Government decently, the facts are otherwise; that it has been willing all the time to treat the Government decently and give a decent price, the facts are otherwise. Now I have completed my sentence, I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I decline to notice—

Mr. REED. You rose to ask me a question. I do not care whether you decline to notice anything or not.

Mr. OLIVER. The Senator has yielded to me the floor.

Mr. REED. I did not yield the floor. I decline to yield.

Mr. OLIVER. The Senator has yielded to me, and I demand the right to finish the sentence which I began.

Mr. REED. I yielded for a question, and I will debate any question with the distinguished Senator he wants to debate at any time, but I do not intend to lose the floor until I have occupied it for a few moments longer.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not want to deprive the Senator of the floor, but I want to say this, that the Senator is saying what is utterly without foundation. He accuses me of voting money into my own pocket. I will say no more about his personal attack upon me, the second time he has made it in a manner unworthy of any member of this body, but I do want to say that he evades from the question I put to him in order to divert and becloud the issues by making a personal attack on me. I challenge him to produce a single false statement. He says it is full of falsehoods. He does not name one. Give us some particulars, if you please.

Mr. REED. Now, the Senator says that my statement is untrue in regard to him voting money into his own pocket.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that we are getting pretty close to infringing a rule of the Senate.

Mr. REED. I thought possibly so; but the Chair permitted the Senator to make that statement, and I am going to insist, with all respect to the Chair, on my right to reply to it. The Senator made that statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let us at least keep as near within the parliamentary rule as we possibly can. Not to do so leads to bad feeling.

Mr. REED. I shall keep within the rule. I say that the Senator on the floor of this body admitted that he owned a large amount of steel stock, and that it was in a concern that was the parent company of a concern engaged in the manufacture of armor plate; and I shall put the Senator's admission as it appears in the RECORD in my remarks at this point.

Mr. OLIVER. I insist, Mr. President, on everything that the Senator puts in the RECORD being read or stated at length.

Mr. REED. Well, I imagine the Senator naturally objects to having his own admission put into the RECORD—

Mr. OLIVER. It is already there.

Mr. REED. But I think I can find the Senator's admission even while on my feet, and if I do I will read it again into the RECORD. The Senator knows that whatever will defeat the building of a Government armor plant will enable the private plant to increase its price and its profits; that if it makes profits those profits will be distributed to the stockholders; and that, finally, in the end some of those profits will be found emitting a musical jingle from the pockets of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I call attention to clause 2 of Rule XIX, and insist that it shall be observed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Pennsylvania have each transgressed the rule, in that the rule of the Senate clearly provides that the motives of a Senator shall not be impugned on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the rule shall be observed. I care not to what Senator it applies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks this has gone far enough, and gone too far.

Mr. REED. Very well. I simply want to remark, in passing, that I have not been talking about motives; I have been talking about facts and results.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a second?

Mr. REED. I will.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I feel, in justice to the people of America, that this document should be expunged from the RECORD, and I move you, sir, if it is possible, that the document be expunged from the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, it is ordered printed in the RECORD, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, it is ordered printed as a public document; and I move, then, to rescind the action by which this document was ordered to be printed as a public document.

Mr. PENROSE. The motion is not in order, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was done by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action was taken by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, I ask unanimous consent, most respectfully, Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There seems to be an objection.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Very well. Mr. President, I have, as I recall, received one of these books on which the postage—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Missouri yielding?

Mr. REED. I am not yielding the floor.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am not asking the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is afraid the Senator is.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; I only want to say, with the consent of the Senator from Missouri, that the book I received, as I recall, had some 50 or 56 cents in postage stamps on it. That, of course, will be saved to the unfortunate, poverty-stricken company, which has not made a dividend for many years, according to those gentlemen, for they can send it now as a public document.

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. President, I call attention to this remarkable occurrence of this morning. It is stated that a Senator is out of order who quotes a Senator's own words upon the floor of the Senate. If I can secure the information which I want, I shall read those words. If I do not get it now I will put it in later in the day.

I call attention of the Senate to this fact, that my colleague [Senator STONE] has suggested to me that when once a document has been made a public document any part of it is frankable; so that the authors of this document can, if they see fit, select garbled excerpts or such partisan excerpts as they may desire and send them over the United States without paying any postage.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What amendment is pending before the Senate now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no amendment pending before the Senate now.

Mr. REED. The bill is pending, however, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is pending and open to amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have found the admission of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and will at this point digress to read it into my remarks. On March 21, 1916, I was endeavoring to address the Senate when I was interrupted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. I quote:

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, the Senator well knows that the argument ad hominem is about as weak an argument as can be presented on behalf of any case, and the fact that he has presented it shows how weak his case is now.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, there is an old line which may be paraphrased so that it will run—

"How sweet the watch dog's honest bark,
Loud baying when we draw near home."

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The galleries are again admonished that they must not show approval or disapproval of the action on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. REED. I say, since the Senator wants to make it pointed, that if I owned \$500,000 worth of the stock of any company engaged in Government contracts I would not plead for a continuance of those contracts.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. Not until I finish reading.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that he himself withdrew that statement.

Mr. REED. Oh, I am going to read all of it, including the Senator's correction in which he admitted the child, but insisted that "it was a very small one."

Mr. OLIVER. My correction of the Senator's misstatement.

Mr. REED. As to the amount?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. REED. But not as to the principle. [Reading:]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I think, as a matter of personal privilege, I have a right to say something here.

Mr. REED. Not in my time.

Mr. OLIVER. If the Senator wants to crowd me out on a question of personal privilege—

Mr. REED. I do not object, if I can have the time deducted from the three minutes that elapse between now and 4 o'clock, when, as all know, the gavel will fall, and we must proceed to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not deducting time. It is not the Chair's business.

Mr. REED. There will be plenty of time for the Senator to make reply before the debate closes.

That will be found on page 4539 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of March 21, 1916.

On March 22, 1916, the Senator from Pennsylvania rose to make his correction. I quote from page 4590.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I rise to ask for a correction in the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings.

In the discussion upon the armor-plate bill yesterday evening the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] was kind enough to refer to the fact that during the investigation conducted by a Senate committee a few years ago I had stated that I was the owner of a thousand shares of preferred stock of the United States Steel Corporation. In that connection the Senator used this language:

"Mr. REED. I say, since the Senator wants to make it pointed, that if I owned \$500,000 worth of the stock of any company engaged in Government contracts I would not plead for a continuance of those contracts."

Mr. President, the par value of the preferred stock of the United States Steel Corporation is \$100 per share. The par value of 1,000 shares, therefore, as can easily be seen, is \$100,000. The market price yesterday, as I see from this morning's paper, was \$117 a share, which would make the ultimate value of that stock \$117,000. So the Senator from Missouri in placing its value at \$500,000 evidently made an enormous mistake in calculation.

The attention of the Senator from Missouri was called to this statement this morning, and he informed my secretary that he would be here this morning and ask that the correction be made. He has not so appeared, and I now ask that "\$500,000" in this place in the RECORD, on page 4539 be changed to read "\$117,000."

In this connection I wish to say, as I stated to the committee when I stated that I was the owner of that stock, that I have never considered this security to be in any way affected by any measure that came before Congress since I have been a Senator. It is a preferred stock. It pays 7 per cent. It can not under any circumstances pay more, and in the improbable circumstances of the profits of the corporation being insufficient to pay 7 per cent in one year the dividend will be paid out of the profits of succeeding years.

Even if it were subject to this legislation, the amount is so small compared with the enormous capital of the corporation that of any money that might be made out of the armor-plate business my share would be so small as to be infinitesimal.

Those who know me, Mr. President, know well that any vote of mine in the Senate will never be controlled by my personal interests. I have on more than one occasion voted in direct opposition to my personal and financial interests on measures coming before the Senate. I shall never vote in accordance with my personal interest unless the interest of the public and of my constituents demands it.

If my interest in this corporation had been far larger or if I had been interested in the securities of any of the other companies engaged in this business, as I am not, I would have acted and voted just as I acted and voted yesterday, for the reason that I believe the measure to be inimical to the public interests and injurious to the constituency which I aim to represent.

And, of course, that is the trouble. A man always believes that the public interests can be best served by taking care of himself.

The Senator from Pennsylvania continued:

I ask that this correction be made, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hardly sees how the Senator from Pennsylvania can change the language used by the Senator from Missouri. The Senator has made his statement, and when the Senator from Missouri comes in, in accordance with his promise to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Chair assumes that the Senator from Missouri will make the change; but the Chair can not change the language of a Senator.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the ruling of the Chair is correct, and I made the request to call attention not only to the misstatement made by the Senator from Missouri but to his failure to respond to an invitation to correct that mistake.

While the Senator was speaking, or immediately afterwards, I came into the Senate to make the correction. Now, the fact was, the Senator from Pennsylvania got the floor the moment the Senate had convened. I have read you all he said, which took probably about five minutes. Before he had concluded his remarks I was in the Senate, and shortly thereafter went over to the Senator's seat and asked him if he wanted me to make the correction. I then said:

Mr. President, I desire to make a statement to the Senate that has nothing to do with this debate, but which relates to a correction of a statement which I made on yesterday.

On yesterday I read the evidence to the effect that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] owned 1,000 shares of stock in the United States Steel Corporation. A moment afterwards, in a colloquy with the Senator from Pennsylvania, I made this statement:

"I say, since the Senator wants to make it pointed, that if I owned \$500,000 worth of the stock of any company engaged in Government contracts I would not plead for a continuance of those contracts."

This statement was made as to the value of the stock during the course of debate and without any time to look up values. When I used the figures "\$500,000" I had in mind the figures quoted in the press as to the value of certain stocks. My attention was called this morning by the secretary of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that this particular stock was not worth \$500 a share, which it would have to be in order to make the aggregate \$500,000, but that it was worth only \$117 a share, which would make the aggregate amount \$117,000. I stated to the Senator's secretary very readily that I would make the correction, but I left my office to come to the Senate just before 12 o'clock, and I was detained by a gentleman who called on me. Therefore, during my absence, the Senator from Pennsylvania asked to have the RECORD corrected on his own motion, so that the figures "\$117,000" will be substituted for "\$500,000." Had I been here, I would have asked that that be done myself. I arrived just a few moments after the Senator from Pennsylvania had made his statement.

I am entirely willing, and I ask that the statement be corrected, so that the figures "\$117,000" shall be substituted for "\$500,000." I am very glad to make this correction in the interest of accuracy.

All I have to say by way of condonation of my own mistake is to remark that it was quite a natural mistake for me to make, because I am not at all familiar with stock quotations and do not follow them. I am glad to make the correction.

Mr. President, there is the statement in all its beautiful accuracy; but we get down to the point that the fact is here, and the Senate and the country will draw their own conclusions from the fact.

At the proper time—I can not do it now unless I can get unanimous consent—but I shall ask unanimous consent for consideration of a motion, which I understand is the only one that can be made under the rules of the Senate, that there shall not be printed at the Government expense more than 100 copies of this document, and that the franking privilege shall be denied any of these documents in addition to the 100 copies.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I shall feel prompted to object to the motion, because I consider it unnecessary. The standing orders of the Senate restrict the number of these documents to 1,600, and I do not think any great amount of damage can be done by having 1,600 copies printed.

Mr. REED. One thousand six hundred will be printed at the public expense. But additional copies can be ordered from the Government Printing Office and obtained at substantially the cost to the Government. There is no limit to the amount; it may be 16,000 or 160,000 or 16,000,000 copies, and the entire 16,000,000, if that many are ordered, can be sent out under the franking privilege.

Mr. PENROSE. Only by a Senator or a Representative.

Mr. REED. Why, certainly; and it is not hard to tell who the two Senators will be whose franks will be abundantly offered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I desire to make the point that a Senator has not the right to send them unless he prints them and pays for them with his own funds. He has not a right to do it when they are printed and paid for by a corporation, for example.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to say that that is being done by individuals now. Certain documents printed by this Congress are being paid for by outside corporations and sent under Senators' franks.

Mr. SMOOT. A million of them.

Mr. REED. There is no question about the fact that that is the habitual practice; and suppose it were not. Let me call the Senator's attention—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was not seeking to raise a question as to what was the practice. I wanted to call attention to the fact that such a practice violated the law and, in my judgment, subjected the man who did it to serious trouble.

Mr. REED. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that if a private corporation were to contribute money to a Senator to pay for these documents there probably would be no way to reach it, except that the Senate might treat it as a breach of the privileges of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to interfere with the line of argument of the Senator from Missouri; it was to challenge the propriety of such a distribution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It occurs to me, Mr. President, that consent having been given in the way that it was, a motion to reconsider the vote by which consent was given is in order. If a bill should pass by unanimous consent, I do not think anybody would contend that a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed would not be in order. This consent was given without anybody seeming to take notice of it except the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who consented to the request made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I was present in the Chamber, but, being engaged in another matter, did not realize what was being done; and it seems to me that where consent was given in this way, a motion to reconsider ought to be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled on that question. Bills are not passed by unanimous consent. They are passed by a ye-and-nay vote. That is, the yeas are called for, and the nays are called for. The reason why anybody who voted against a matter can move for a reconsideration of the vote where the yeas and nays are not taken is because they are not recorded, and nobody knows.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Could not a bill be passed by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Never that the Chair knows of.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does not the Chair agree that if there is no objection a resolution can be passed by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly; but there is not any question of doubt in the Chair's mind, this proposition having been taken up this morning, and unanimous consent having been given for the publication of this matter as a public document, that the only way to get rid of it is by unanimous consent.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. Has the Senator estimated this matter in any way as to what it would cost to have this document printed?

Mr. REED. I do not know.

Mr. PENROSE. I suppose it will cost a couple of hundred dollars.

Mr. KENYON. I think we on this side have perhaps gotten into the habit of relying upon the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to object to these requests for unanimous consent. I think he has announced a number of times that he was going to object to such requests, and I am surprised that he sat quiet.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was present when the request was made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but it was made in this way: The Senator from Pennsylvania stated that on account of certain statements that were ordered to be printed in the RECORD yesterday, requested by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], it was thought that the matter presented by him ought to be printed as a public document, and the Senator from South Carolina said that he thought so, too, and had no objection.

Mr. TILLMAN. I said I had no objection. I did not say that I thought it ought to be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. I so understood the Senator, but I must be mistaken. At least, the Senator said he had no objection, and I also thought he said that, on account of the information which was printed on his request yesterday, this also ought to be printed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I said I had no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Therefore I did not make an objection to it, Mr. President. I hope to see the day when the Senate will take up the printing bill now on the calendar and pass it, and then all questions of this character will never again occur in the Senate. All such requests will take their regular course, as they should do. Every request for the printing of a public document ought to go to the Committee on Printing and be passed on by that committee.

In the past I have tried hard to stop this growing and costly practice, but I became discouraged. Senators would give me to understand that my objection appeared to them as an unfriendly act.

I had some figures in my desk that I wanted to call the attention of Senators to to show the Senate how wild we are going in printing the hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of next to useless matter at Government expense. It is getting so now, Mr. President, that any crank in the United States can prepare an article upon most any subject, send it to some Senator, and ask him to request to have it printed as a public document, and in most cases it is done. It is of no earthly good for the use of the Senate or for anyone else, but we print them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Rarely ever.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think it is evident that the franking privilege is very much abused. I want to give an instance in my own experience. We all know that immense documents have been sent out by corporations under frank at the expense of the Government, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. I myself had a public document printed. I sent out the usual number that was allowed to me. A gentleman who had them printed sent some money to me and asked me to have additional copies printed so that he could send them out. I told him I did not think I had the power to do it. I have been criticizing this method of using the mails, of printing documents for distribution by other than Senators, and I declined to do it. He sent the request to another Senator. I will not mention that Senator, and I will not criticize him for doing it. When I refused, he sent it to another Senator and had it done, and then to another Senator and had it done. So you see the evil effects of this practice. In one case it cost the Government, I know, \$50,000; and I know now of a document—I am informed by the document room—of which a million copies were sent out at Government expense, and how much it cost the Government God only knows.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me just a moment?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina if he does not know of another case in which a certain pamphlet designated the "Truth About Sugar" was printed and published and circulated under a Senator's frank? In that case I am informed that a suit is now pending, brought by the Post Office Department, for approximately \$71,000 to recover postage that should have been paid for the circulation of that document.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state that the reason for the suit referred to by the Senator was because the matter was changed, the department claimed, from the original document submitted

by the Senator who asked that it be printed as a public document.

I will also say to the Senator that there was another document printed in answer to the document "Facts About Sugar" at the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I do not think, however, that is the proper title.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not certain about the title of the pamphlet. It was the "Truth About Sugar," or "Sugar at a Glance."

Mr. SMOOT. "Sugar at a Glance" is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON. But it was a document in the interest of the Sugar Trust, and it was circulated at the expense of the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. The other one was in favor of the Refiners' Trust.

Mr. OVERMAN. They had a right to do it, but not when it was changed, as the Post Office Department claims. The fact is, the printing bill ought to be passed.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED. I will be through in a moment. I was about to conclude.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to suggest that Rule XIII provides that—

When a question has been decided by the Senate any Senator voting with the prevailing side may, on the same day or on either of the next two days of actual session thereafter, move a reconsideration.

Mr. PENROSE. That is a vote.

Mr. SWANSON. The second clause of the rule provides that—

When a bill, resolution, report, amendment, order or message upon which a vote has been taken shall have gone out of the possession of the Senate and been communicated to the House of Representatives the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the House to return the same.

I do not see why this should not be reconsidered like anything else. The order was made by unanimous consent; it does not follow that it is finally disposed of, and the only remedy is by a motion to reconsider. It seems to me the Senator from Missouri can bring this matter up later by entering a motion to reconsider.

Mr. REED. There was no vote. There having been no vote, of course no one voted.

Mr. SWANSON. That is the only way it can possibly be remedied. The motion may be entered to reconsider, and to-morrow we can consider it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator think that a unanimous consent can be rescinded by a vote of the Senate?

Mr. SWANSON. A unanimous consent can pass a bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is not a bill.

Mr. SWANSON. It is an order of the Senate, and a vote to reconsider can be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senate can set aside a unanimous-consent agreement only by another unanimous-consent agreement, according to our rule.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator hold that if a bill is passed by unanimous consent it can not be reconsidered by unanimous consent?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not see how any Senator would have the right under our rules to move a reconsideration.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest to the Senator from Missouri to enter a motion to reconsider and let it come up to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to Rule XXIX, in relation to the printing of documents. It specifically provides that—

Every motion to print documents, reports, and other matter transmitted by either of the executive departments, or to print memorials, petitions, accompanying documents—

And so forth. I will not read the whole rule—

shall, unless the Senate otherwise order, be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Now, unless unanimous consent had been given, it would of necessity have gone to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. REED. Let me ask the Senator this question.

Mr. SMOOT. But unanimous consent was given.

Mr. REED. Was there any order made that this document should not go to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. SMOOT. No; unanimous consent was asked that it be printed as a public document when it was presented to the Senate, and that unanimous consent was given. If there had been objection, necessarily it would have gone to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Missouri on this subject? Perhaps, as the chairman of the Committee on Printing, I am expected to say something, inasmuch as it involves the law and the rule governing the printing of documents.

The law is that when a document is presented and a motion is made to print it, unless it is accompanied by an estimate as to the cost it must go to the Committee on Printing. By unanimous consent, of course, that can all be waived and the document can be ordered printed. When this document was presented I was absent from the Chamber attending a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I know nothing about what has taken place except what I have heard in the discussion since just coming into the Chamber.

The number of copies printed of a public document would be about 1,245 under the present rule of distribution. Additional copies can be ordered by any Senator who pays for those additional copies at an advance of about 10 per cent above the cost. So the Government does not lose anything by the printing of additional copies, but, rather, makes when additional copies are ordered. Any Senator can order those copies printed and pay for them. He must take the responsibility of ordering them. It is utterly immaterial whether he permits some person interested in the subject to furnish the funds with which to print them or not. He has a perfect right to do that. If it is a matter which is of great public importance to the whole country, it may be worth while for those who feel it a public duty and a public obligation to raise the funds necessary to print it as a public document. There is no violation of law in doing so; there is no impropriety in doing so. The responsibility is with the Senator to determine whether the document is one worthy of distribution and is of public interest or otherwise.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator—

Mr. NORRIS. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that I have the floor. I do this simply that I may hold it, not to interfere with the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I wish to advise the Senator from Missouri that if he yields further with reference to this matter I shall make the point of order under the rule. I do not want to do it, but—

Mr. FLETCHER. Then I will not, of course, ask the Senator to yield further.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask the Senator from Missouri to yield to me.

Mr. FLETCHER. Except to say that, as has been indicated by others, the printing bill is on the calendar. The calendar has been called over and over again, and objection to its consideration has been raised because it could not be disposed of under the five-minute rule. I have urged the passage of the printing bill. It would correct many of the objectionable features in the present printing law and abuses which occur under that law, and it would save the Government from \$700,000 to \$800,000 a year in expenditures. I want to get the printing bill before the Senate, but under the conditions here it has been impossible to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I dislike—

Mr. REED. Since notice has been served on me by the Senator from Washington that I must not yield without yielding the floor, and as I have only a few words to say, while I desire to allow the Senator from Nebraska—

Mr. NORRIS. I think I could ask the Senator a question without any danger of taking the floor from him.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. I will put my suggestion in the form of a question. I will ask the Senator from Missouri if it is not true that while, as the Senator from Florida says, the number is limited, and after that somebody will have to pay for the printing if a larger number is called for, after they are printed they are sent through the mail without limit? There is no law limiting the number that can be sent through the mail under a frank without the payment of postage?

Mr. REED. That brings me to the single observation that I desire to make in order to conclude what I have to say, and but for the colloquies that have gone on I would have been through long ago.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] estimates that it will cost but \$200 to print this public document. He gave that answer in response to an interrogatory by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON].

Mr. President, that is not the point at all. When this document has been made a public document it can be printed to the number, I believe, of 3,500 copies at Government expense. If that were all that is involved in this question, I would not take the time of the Senate to discuss it.

Mr. PENROSE. One thousand five hundred.

Mr. REED. Well, 1,500. I care nothing about that. But when it is made a public document, two things result.

First, it goes out to the general public as a document of such dignity and importance and truth that the Senate of the United States has solemnly concluded that it ought to be furnished to the public under the sanction and authority of the Government itself. Hence, instead of going to the people as a mere pronouncement by an interested party it goes out with the brand of approval by the Government upon it.

The second proposition is that there is no limit upon the number of copies that can be printed in the Government Printing Office, provided somebody pays for it, and there is no limit upon the number any Senator may send out or permit to be sent out under his frank. So "the bug under the chip" is the franking privilege which this private corporation has this morning gained the right to use by the unanimous consent of the Senate. And we are told that a unanimous consent is like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, it can not be altered.

Mr. President, "Sugar at a Glance" went out as a public document. I doubt whether the Senator who introduced that document had the slightest idea it would be used in the manner it was, but the country was literally flooded with it. Other documents that I need not refer to have been sent out; I think in one instance over a million copies of a document were franked. This has already been said by other Senators this morning.

The document now in question is made a public document, first that it may have the franking privilege, so that this enormously rich private corporation shall enjoy the right to send its literature and its message and its appeal to the country without paying a penny of postage, while every farmer and every mechanic and every merchant and every private citizen must pay the full postage for everything he sends.

Second, that it may appear that the Government's sanction has been put upon this ex parte statement, and that some people will be led to believe it to be an official statement issued by the Government itself. I say so for the reason that the document has already been printed, printed as you will observe in all sorts of fancy type upon elegant paper and in sufficient numbers, so that Members of Congress to whom it professes to be an appeal have already been furnished with it.

There was, therefore, no necessity for making it a public document in order to bring it to the attention of Congress. There was no necessity for making it a public document in order to bring it to the attention of the country, because it is already printed. All that this beneficent and kindly institution, that by its own confession has plundered it for 29 years, can gain by the franking privilege is to escape the postage, for if it wanted to pay the postage, the document already being printed, all it has to do is to put a Government stamp upon it and put it in the mail.

I understand—I do not know that I am accurate—that the postage upon this particular document costs 56 cents, although that may be a mistake. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], however, gives me that information.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is my knowledge of it. I think the stamps on the envelope I received indicated 50 or 56 cents.

Mr. LANE. I footed it up. It amounted to 56 cents on the copy I received.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Then I am verified.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. I intend to address the Senate when the Senator from Missouri is through, and I raise the point of order that this informal colloquy is not in order.

Mr. REED. I am not responsible for it.

Mr. PENROSE. I know the Senator is not. I ask for order in the Chamber, and that the Senator from Missouri may be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. President, it was said in the old days corporations had too much influence in the halls of legislation. It was charged that this was true in the general assemblies of States. It was charged that this was true in the Congress of the United States. It was believed by many people that great institutions came to Congress to obtain special privileges. It was believed that too often their attorneys, their representatives, their hirelings, their stockholders sat in the Halls of Congress and voted the money of the people into the coffers of their respective corporations.

The people of the country had some reason to believe that these influences were at work, that they were too potential, that their arms were too long and their fingers too active, that the Public Treasury and the public right suffered by reason of the services of such men.

Against that a protest nation wide was heard. It took many forms. It produced many varieties of organization and of party. The insurgent element of the Republican Party came into being in protest against such conditions. It rose to such power as to temporarily overwhelm within the Republican Party the emissaries of the old régime.

There met down at Chicago only four short years ago a seething and almost turbulent crowd of representatives of the revolt against the authority of the big interests. They were excited, earnest, determined that they would overthrow the sinister and evil influences within the old party of which they had once been a part. Ah, what a gallant sight it was as these knights of reform assembled upon the field of Armageddon. They came in glittering armor, with burnished swords, their gallant banners waving in the breeze, and the song Onward Christian Soldiers rolling in a volume of noisy harmony from their enthusiastic lips. They denounced by name certain men as betrayers of the Republican Party and likewise as betrayers of the public interest. They denounced specifically the measure their distinguished men had fastened upon the country. They condemned in voices of thunder the iniquities that have grown up. And so for four years the country turned to that element as at least a force so great, so potential, and so earnest that it would prevent a recurrence for many years to come of the old methods of the old régime.

But, sir, they had another convention in Chicago. The insurgents met in one hall and the old régime assembled in another hall. The insurgent with his eyes turned ever toward the conspicuous if not beautiful figure that had led them in the fight four years before waited now upon him, staked the very salvation of their party and their cause upon his word.

The old régime, "wiser in its day and generation than the children of light," proceeded to go on and transact business "in the good old way." It was the wise old crowd. It knew what was going to happen to the soldiers of Armageddon. It understood what was to be the fate of the crusaders. The old bosses had already arranged the program, set the trap, fixed the bait, and were simply waiting for an opportune time when its jaws would close down upon the unsuspecting hands and feet of the insurgents. The Bull Moose had been blinded. His sense of smell even was gone. He was staggering around in the political wilderness without knowledge as to the points of the compass, without hope, and without habitat, but always his plaintive moanings were a sort of inarticulate appeal for a word from his leader and master. The leader waited, waited until both conventions had adjourned, waited until the hour had past when the Bull Moose might recover from the blow of the big stick he intended to wield sufficiently to name some other candidate, waited until the members of the tribe had all returned to their respective homes, and then the big Bull Moose proceeded to use his club with brutal and savage force upon those who had followed and almost worshiped him.

I heard it well expressed by a remark. In introduction I remark that I wonder how many Members of the Senate ever lived out in the country. For their information I will state that every boy who has lived in the country knows that the favorite trick of the country boy upon the city lad who comes to visit him is to "take him out sniping." That game, I say for the benefit of the uninitiated from cities, consists in telling the city boy that there are many snipes in a certain ravine, that all you have to do is to hold a sack after dark down at the end of the ravine, with a lighted candle inside the sack, and that the rest of the boys will walk along the ravine and drive toward the sack, that as soon as the snipe see the light they will walk into it. And all the city boy will have to do will be to close its mouth, shoulder his bag of game, and march home in triumph.

That city boy is always impressed with the idea that because he is a guest he is especially favored by being permitted to hold the sack. So they take the poor fellow out some place where it is very lonesome, where he has no company but the silent stars and there are no voices but the whispering winds, and they plant him there and go away and leave him. He has been cautioned that he must not say a word; that he must not utter a sound. So in absolute silence for hours and hours he waits, while the other lads have gone home and gone to bed. That is called "sniping."

I heard of the remark of an old farmer in my State the other day. He had been an insurgent; he had carried the Roosevelt banner; he had sung hallelujahs to the great cause; his voice had been as loud as that of the bull of Bashan and his heart had been as stout as that of any gallant crusader who marched to the Holy Land in the tenth or eleventh century. He was a real soldier of Armageddon. Somebody said to him, "What are your politics?" "Well," he said, "dinged if I know."

I am one of them suckers that Roosevelt took out snipe huntin', but I'll be cussed if I will ever be idiot enough to carry the sack home to him." [Laughter.]

I heard it expressed in another way, and for the delectation of my insurgent friends I will relate that. An old fellow in my State who has reached the point where he is a mere onlooker at events, and with a sort of quizzical and philosophical smile surveys the field, remarked the morning after Roosevelt had declined the nomination, "Well, Roosevelt got all the cats in one bag and just toted them out onto the desert and dropped them, didn't he?" [Laughter.]

I think those two anecdotes absolutely cover the case; but this is the thing I call attention to: The old régime has been mighty modest in the Senate for the last four years. They have feared two forces; they feared the Democracy, which stood here militant, as it to-day stands here, militant yet; but they also feared that element in their own party which has been so well typified and led by the gallant Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], with whom I often disagree, but whose motives I never challenge. They feared that element. But the field of Armageddon, that four years ago was trampled into dust by the hosts there marshalled, is now covered over with the grass and flowers of forgetfulness. The insurgent has been routed or tricked and betrayed. If you hunt for an insurgent to-day, you are likely to find him with both boots sticking from under a standpatter's bed. [Laughter.] The insurgent party is no longer a potential force. The old crowd is in the saddle.

The first fruit of the supremacy of the old régime is now on display. The Bethlehem Steel Co. has the impudence to come into the Congress of the United States and ask the franking privilege for its advertising matter, and it gets it at the request of a gentleman whom every insurgent in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific denounced, and the other sponsor is financially interested in the result.

Mr. President, this document may have been so put before the Senate that there is no way to prevent its being printed, but I shall try to find a means to limit the number that shall be printed at the public expense. I presume that it will now be in order for every munition factory whose coffers are bulging with the profits of blood to come here and have its propaganda published. If we grant the privilege to the Bethlehem Steel Co., why not to the Midvale Steel Co.? Why not to the parent of all of them—the Steel Trust? Why not grant it to all of these great concerns? If to them, why not to all corporations having a sufficiently large capital so that they are entitled to direct representation in the United States Senate?

Let me say this word in conclusion: I would not have thus thrust myself upon the time of the Senate while this great bill is before it but that out of the exposure of what is being done for this armor-plate company we may gain this one lesson: The sooner the United States Government takes the last penny of profits out of war the better it will be for our people and for our country; the sooner we make it so that there will be no man in this country financially interested in producing a condition that will make a market for powder, or shot, or shell, or cannon, or saber, the better it will be for our country.

I can not forget that, running along a parallel line with patriotism, also is to be found the hideous form and figure and face of selfishness. I can not forget that running upon the other side of patriotism is the still more hideous and diabolic form of cupidity. I can not forget my history, which tells me that in the great War of the Rebellion, when sons were leaving the arms of their mothers to go forth upon the stricken field, when husbands were saying good-by to wives and children, when gallant men were marching forth to bare their bosoms to the storms of war, and when they knew that in the providence of God and the chance of battle, in all human probability, their final bed would be beneath the stars and their winding sheet the snows of winter—that while those men were doing that thing there were plenty of capitalists in this country of the Bethlehem Steel Co. type who were quite willing to sell rotten meat and maggoty bacon and vile flour to be used by the men who were in camp and upon the battle lines. I do not forget that selfishness and cupidity still live in our country. When I see a concern that has been making armor plate and selling it to our Government for more than it had charged foreign Governments I know that it is not as patriotic as it is avaricious. When I see that concern come into this Senate with a document which boldly states that, now it is threatened with Government competition, it will sell steel for less than it has sold it for 29 years past, although, according to its own statement, the price of all labor and material is higher than it has been in 29 years; when I find it coming here with that sort of confession, boldly printed out, I know that it has been robbing my Government. Then, when I see it stoop to the form of petty larceny, through which

it seeks to gain the privilege to send out its literature without the payment of a penny of postage to the Government, my gorge rises as will rise the gorge of the country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. PENROSE addressed the Chair. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I understand a question has been raised in this debate that it was not in order to move to reconsider a resolution that had been passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. PENROSE. This was not a resolution, Mr. President, Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was an order, which is the same thing.

Mr. PENROSE. I asked unanimous consent to have the document printed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly, but it takes an order of the Senate to print the document; and when it appears in the RECORD to-morrow morning, the RECORD will show that the Senator from Pennsylvania asked unanimous consent to have a certain document printed, and that it was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let me finish my sentence, please. But when it appears in the Journal it will appear as an order of the Senate adopted by the Senate, authorizing the printing of this document. Now, I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to the fact that the question was never submitted to the Senate as to whether or not it would give unanimous consent. Had 't been so submitted, I certainly should have objected. I sat here, and it never occurred to me that the question was put to the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] simply addressed the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], and being unable to hear what he said I assumed it pertained to some amendment to the naval bill.

I have here a complete record of what was said by various Senators, and if it will not interfere with the remarks which the Senator from Alabama is about to make, I shall be glad to read it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that I, of course, accept the statement of the Chair with reference to the matter as to what occurred, and it is not that point to which I desire to address my remarks.

Mr. THOMPSON. I repeat, that unanimous consent of the Senate was not asked; and no request for unanimous consent was submitted by the Chair to be acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator from Kansas desires to read the record of what occurred, he may do so in my time, if there is no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON. I shall be very glad to do so. I read from the reporter's transcript, which has been furnished me, of what occurred, as follows:

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, in view of the data submitted by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. TILLMAN] in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and to which, of course, I have no objection—I feel it my duty to make the request to have this statement of the Bethlehem Steel Co., largely bearing on what the chairman has inserted in the RECORD, printed as a public document. I hope the chairman will have no objection to that request.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have no objection whatever, sir.

Mr. PENROSE. I make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

There was, as I have stated, no request for unanimous consent submitted to the Senate. The most that can be said is that a motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania in the form of a request was unanimously agreed to, in which situation any Senator may move for a reconsideration under Rule XIII of the Senate. But in any event it is absurd to say that it is impossible to set aside any order or action of the Senate, whether made by unanimous consent or otherwise.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I take it—and if I am wrong, I presume the Chair will notify the Senate at once, and close this debate without further discussion—that when that discussion took place in an informal way and the Chair stated there was unanimous consent granted, the clerks at the desk wrote an order for the printing of that document in the parliamentary Journal of the Senate, and that the order stands. Of course, if it does not, the Chair will immediately correct me, and I will sit down. The point that I make, Mr. President, is that if that order is granted by the Senate it is of no more weight, no more influence, no more binding power than if the Senator from Pennsylvania had risen in his seat and asked unanimous consent that he might be allowed to make a motion, and then had made the motion asking that the document be printed. Of course, if he had made the motion in that way, nobody would contest the question that a motion to reconsider would be in order.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. If it had not been done by unanimous consent, the request would have gone to the Committee on Printing under the rules.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly; but the Senator from Pennsylvania failed to hear the premise of my statement. I said "if the Senator from Pennsylvania had risen in his seat and asked unanimous consent to make a motion," which, of course, would have avoided the necessity of its going to the committee.

Mr. President, we do not amend or reconsider what the Record shows; we amend and reconsider what the Journal shows, and in the Journal of the Senate there is written an order in the same binding form if it is made by unanimous consent as if it is made by a vote of the Senate; and certainly that should be the case, for it is on the same basis. When it is done by unanimous consent the order is issued as the order of every man in the body who is in the Chamber, but that is all.

Now, I take it that the Chair can not have in mind any place or any set of rules where a motion to reconsider a motion made by unanimous consent can not be made except in the Senate of the United States. It is certainly not true in the House of Representatives or in any rules that I have read. As to certain orders it is not true in the Senate of the United States, because, in reference to certain orders the rules of the Senate prohibit a motion to reconsider, and specify how the original order shall be reconsidered. Paragraph 3 of Rule No. XII of the Senate Rules reads as follows:

No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a roll call ordered for the purpose by the presiding officer, it shall be disclosed that a quorum of the Senate is present; and when a unanimous consent is thus given the same shall operate as the order of the Senate, but any unanimous consent may be revoked by another unanimous consent granted in the manner prescribed above upon one day's notice.

Now, Mr. President, this rule relates to what? To the passage of bills and joint resolutions? No; this rule relates to a motion—

For the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution.

In other words, it is in a way a modified cloture rule. It is a cloture rule that we can agree to by unanimous consent, and in the adoption of this cloture rule the rules of the Senate say how it shall be carried out. It does not relate to the passage of a bill or a resolution or an order, but it relates entirely to the question of the fixing of a specific date to vote. Then it says:

And when a unanimous consent is thus given—

"Thus given"; not given generally, but "thus given"; given for the purpose of fixing a specific date for a vote—the same shall operate—

How?

as the order of the Senate—

Just as if it had been passed by a vote of the Senate—

but any unanimous consent may be revoked by another unanimous consent granted.

What does that relate to? There is not a period between the word "Senate" and the words "but any unanimous consent"; there is a comma separating them. Unquestionably, then, the latter sentence relates to the sentence preceding, and that sentence relates to the first paragraph, where it says "thus given." So that the whole language of the rule is based on the first lines of the rule, which provide that this unanimous consent shall relate to "the taking of a final vote."

I am addressing my remarks to the Chair, and I desire to have the attention of the Chair, because I intend to make a motion to reconsider this order, and the Chair will have a chance specifically to rule upon it.

Mr. President, if that is so, I know of no other rule of the Senate—there may be older Members here who know of some such rule, and if they do I should be glad if they would call my attention to the fact—which prescribes how a unanimous-consent order shall be set aside; and this paragraph in Rule XII unquestionably relates to an order for the closure of debate, and there is a reason for it. The Senate has but one method of closing debate, unless it exhausts itself, and that is a rule providing that it may be closed by unanimous consent; and after the Senate has given unanimous consent for the closure of debate, the most difficult thing to accomplish in any legislative body in the world under the rules of the United States Senate, it was natural and proper that the Senate should impose the restriction that debate could be opened again only in the same way in which it was closed; but that does not mean that it

would be impossible for the Senate to reconsider any other vote; in other words, if we debate a bill for days here, carefully consider it, call the roll, and Senators go on record before their constituents as to how they stand upon it, is it to be held that a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on such a measure has not got as much strength and binding power in the United States Senate as a conversation between a Senator on this floor and the Presiding Officer, a conversation that possibly perhaps nine-tenths of the Senate did not hear, but on account of which a unanimous-consent order might be entered, which some day might relate to vital things, and that one Senator alone can put his body between the revocation of that order and justice to the American people? Why, Mr. President, if that is the law of the Senate, then it is a travesty on legislation; it is a disgrace to the representatives of the American people to maintain a rule that in an idle moment, when half of the Senators are absent, would allow the Senate to agree to an order or a bill by unanimous consent, and with reference to which one Senator could prevent any further action in the Senate, no matter if the other 95 Senators were unanimous in favor of revoking the order.

Mr. President, I am not wedded to the rules of the United States Senate. I believe it is the spirit of the American people that the majority is entitled to rule, and, after the minority have had a reasonable opportunity for debate to present their cause to the country, and a reasonable opportunity for amendment to present their program to the country, the majority, under our Constitution and under the sentiment and the ideals of our people, have a right to govern. When you destroy the right of a majority to govern you destroy the genius of the American Constitution and the liberties of the American people.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Alabama yield to me to call his attention to the latest precedent on this subject, one made on March 1, 1915, and a case exactly in point? While there may be earlier precedents which seem contradictory as to the right of the Senate to entertain a motion to reconsider when unanimous consent has been given, the most recent decision which I have been able to find, under date of March 1, 1915, is to the effect that a motion to reconsider is permissible, and should be entertained; and in that case it was submitted to the Senate, and the Senate voted upon the motion to reconsider.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. ROBINSON. That is on page 4946 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Sixty-third Congress, third session. That case, upon a casual reading, appears to be exactly in point, and there are no cases which I have been able to find that conclusively contradict the position taken by the Senator from Alabama. There are two other cases—if the Senator will permit me to conclude—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. There are only two other cases I find, upon examination, one in the Sixty-second Congress, third session, when a question as to whether or not a unanimous consent had actually been given was presented to the Senate. In that case the question was raised as to whether or not the reconsideration of an agreement entered into by unanimous consent could be made. The then Presiding Officer, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], indicated that in his opinion it could not. But that case would not govern, for the reason that it subsequently appeared that unanimous consent had not been given, or at least there was a question as to whether unanimous consent had been given; and the Chair resubmitted the question, and objection was made.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me to ask him, was not the precedent that he is referring to right now a question raised in regard to the reversal of an order for a vote?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is a very different matter. The question of an order for a vote is prescribed by the rules.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; but the case that I cite as a precedent for the motion is the latest case, the ruling by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], who was then in the Chair, which was not even questioned by the Senate, and was acquiesced in. That was a case where a document had been ordered printed by unanimous consent. The Senator from Oklahoma made a motion, or offered to make a motion, to reconsider the order by which this document had been directed to be printed. Objection was made that the motion was not in order, on the ground that the order had been made by unanimous consent, and could not be rescinded by a motion to reconsider. The

then occupant of the chair made a ruling which appears on page 4946 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Sixty-third Congress, and if I am permitted to do so I will read a little of the language.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] used this language:

I had assumed that these documents which were desired to be printed would be printed without objection; but if an objection is made to Order of Business 323, I do not intend that any of these shall be printed on the other side.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to submit an observation in the nature of a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GALLINGER. By unanimous consent it was ordered that we should consider the calendar under Rule VIII. Under that rule we are entitled to speak once and for five minutes only. A motion to reconsider is a debatable question, and we may talk an hour on that motion, or 10 hours; but, I think, under the unanimous-consent agreement it ought not to be entertained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that the Senate can not be precluded from a motion to reconsider.

Mr. OWEN. I serve notice on the Senators on the other side that if the document provided for in Senate resolution 320, Order of Business 323, is not printed there will not be many of these bills agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. We can stand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion to reconsider was rejected.

If I may be permitted—I shall not insist upon doing so—I want to call attention to the fact that there is a very grave question as to whether or not this unanimous consent was ever given in good faith and in the proper manner. The Senator from Missouri has stated that he made objection to the printing of this document upon yesterday. The request was repeated this morning in his absence, and the record which has been read by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] was made.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. The printing of a document does not depend entirely upon unanimous consent. The Senate can always determine its attitude upon the subject by a motion to print. It has now come to the knowledge of the Senate and of the Senator from Pennsylvania that many Senators, if they had known he was submitting the request for unanimous consent to print that document at public expense, would have made an objection.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. It does seem to me, now, that the Senator from Pennsylvania, under the circumstances, knowing that the Senator from Missouri had objected to it, and knowing that the Senator from Missouri would have objected to it to-day, if he had not been engaged upon other business of the Senate, would consent to a resubmission of this question, and end this debate, and let us go on with the business of the Senate; in other words, let the Senate say now whether or not it wants to print this document, in view of the record that has been made upon the matter. But if he refuses to do that, if he refuses to make the request or consent that the question shall be resubmitted by unanimous consent—which unquestionably the Chair could do—then, in my opinion, under the precedent, which is the latest one, the Chair can submit the question on a motion to reconsider.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think I have the floor.

Mr. PENROSE. I have been trying to get the floor for an hour, and perhaps could offer a solution of this problem had I the floor. I indicated my desire to take the floor quite a long while ago, and the Chair failed to recognize me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that I do not want to lose the floor, as I desire, before taking my seat, to make a motion to reconsider the order; but if the Senator desires, if I can do so without losing the floor, I shall gladly yield to the Senator for an interruption.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator will get it again.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think I can solve the problem in one minute by reading the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Alabama yields to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Alabama can get the floor again easily enough. I am not going to make any 24-hour speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama will not be taken off the floor. He may hold the floor, subject to the interruption for which he has yielded.

Mr. PENROSE. Have I the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; now the Senator has.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, much more commotion has been made over this request of mine than was justified or necessary. I made the request in good faith, desiring to preserve permanent form among the printed documents of the Senate what I considered an important contribution to the armor-plate

controversy. I made it entirely of my own volition, without any request from anyone, desiring to preserve important data on a subject which it will be generally admitted has been involved in prejudice, misrepresentation, misunderstanding, and ignorance. Particularly, in view of the fact that I had been defeated in my contention, any liberal-minded participant in the controversy certainly would have desired to deal with me generously, and to have permitted me at least to have shed the light of such information as I had through the preservation of this matter among other data of the discussion.

I have here, Mr. President, an alleged speech, printed by leave in the House of Representatives, by a Member of that body, entitled "The world-wide War Trust," never delivered by him, and therefore equivalent in its character to a public document, the difference being only technical. Three million copies of this document have been distributed broadcast over the United States.

Here is another document, an alleged speech delivered by a Member of the House of Representatives, printed by leave, entitled "The Navy League unmasked," of which several million copies, I am informed, have been franked at the expense of the Government in the matter of postage, and at the expense of somebody else in the matter of printing and publishing, all over the United States.

I have sat here patiently, Mr. President, year after year, and have had my feelings shocked repeatedly by the character of the material presented to the Senate with the request that it be printed as a public document. It has seemed to me that there was no one so lowly in the scale of life or intelligence but that he could have his ideas permanently embodied in a Senate document. Nor has the absence of a Senator ever been an impediment in the way of another Senator who earnestly desired to have some effusion printed as a public document or as a Senate document.

Thus, the printing as a Senate document of "Dr. Friedmann's new treatment for tuberculosis" was proposed here on the floor of the Senate by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES]. I objected to it. Later on the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] made a speech against it; and yet this was subsequently printed as a Senate document during his absence and during my absence—absolutely an advertising proposition, meant to advertise an alleged cure, which was subsequently condemned by every physician in the United States. When I made objection to Dr. Friedmann's "cure" being printed as a Senate document, with the presumption of the Senate indorsement, I received thousands of letters from all over the United States, from reputable physicians, commending me for my course. Yet Dr. Friedmann's alleged cure was subsequently, in my absence, printed as a Senate document and doubtless spread broadcast over the country by persons interested for their own pecuniary profit in foisting an alleged tuberculosis cure upon the American people. The Senate document was used for purposes of private gain of the meanest character, because the "cure" was subsequently pronounced a fraud; and doubtless the act of printing that Senate document has resulted in the death of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of people. It was printed against my protest and in my absence.

Let us hastily glance over the character of some of the Senate documents, Mr. President. We have had such a classic in literature as "Possibilities of a Democratic administration" printed as a Senate document, and doubtless franked to the many million persons who were misguided as to the possibilities of a Democratic administration for their instruction and betterment, at the expense, doubtless, of the Democratic national committee.

Then, looking a little further down, we see "Silk industry in the United States"—a specialty, a private concern, which has had its affairs printed as a Senate document.

Even, Mr. President, when that distinguished citizen, Mr. David Lubin, visited the tomb of Frederick William Raiffeisen the poetical effusions which he uttered on that memorable occasion were printed as a Senate document. I never heard of Raiffeisen. I have no doubt, however, that I will shed tears when I read the poetical efforts of David Lubin on the memorable occasion of his visit to the tomb of that great man.

Then we have another specialty, "International Federation of Master Cotton Spinners and Manufacturers' Associations." There is a private interest, engaged, incidentally, in making the munitions of war, because cotton is one of the important staples of munitions. Yet that is printed and circulated at the expense of the Government for the benefit of the cotton growers of the South without any criticism from any Senator on this floor.

Then, Mr. President, we have a work worthy, I suppose, to rank with the classics of Greece and Rome, with the philosophical and political essays of Aristotle. It is entitled "Democracy and efficiency." That document was doubtless circu-

lated at the expense of the Democratic national committee. I can not imagine anybody else wanting to circulate it.

I need not refer, except in passing, to the frequent publication of the speeches of the Secretary of the Treasury. I do not intend to read the titles. They are too numerous. It would seem that he can hardly deliver himself upon any public question but that some Democratic Senator comes forward and has his remarks printed as a Senate document.

And so I might go on, Mr. President, with a list of Senate documents; but I do not intend to detain the Senate longer upon that subject. Thirteen addresses of President Wilson have been printed as Senate documents, not in connection with his official duties but before public Democratic gatherings—purely campaign matters.

Mr. President, I could have had these data read by myself and inserted in the Record, or perhaps I could have had them submitted and made part of the hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate; but I did not desire to take the time of this body. My purpose, as I have said, was in good faith to preserve important data for future information. Had the Senator from Missouri conducted himself as befits the dignity of this body, and in a parliamentary manner, and had less of the department and the phraseology of the cheap attendant in the court of quarter sessions, I might long ago have ended this discussion.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. PENROSE. I do not yield, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. PENROSE. I want to finish my remarks.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. PENROSE. I decline to yield.

Mr. REED. I am not asking the Senator to yield. I am rising to call the Chair's attention to the Senator's remarks, to which I am not objecting; but when I do reply in kind—as I certainly shall—I hope the Chair will not call me to order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was consulting with the Senator from Arkansas and did not hear the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED. I know the Chair was.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I did not say anything reflecting upon the Senator's personal character or his motives. I simply referred to the impression which I got concerning his department, which impression I know has been shared by a number of Senators, at least on this side of the Chamber.

Now, Mr. President, I am willing to proceed in this matter according to the rules and in the regular course of procedure; and while it may be irregular for me to make the request, I am willing, if no Senator has any objection, to withdraw the request to have the document printed, and ask to have it referred to the Committee on Printing, following the usual rules of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in that connection I want to take advantage of this occasion to call attention to the law. It is not a question for the Senate by unanimous consent or by motion to waive. It is a statute of Congress that no document can be ordered printed by either House unless it is accompanied by an estimate of cost from the Public Printer, and I think that law ought hereafter to be lived up to. If the document is not accompanied by such an estimate, it can not be ordered printed, even upon motion.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, addressing myself to the question before the Senate, whatever it may be, I want to say, in reply to the Senator from Florida, that he is quite as guilty as any other Member of this body, and, I think, more so, of asking that documents shall be printed without estimates being submitted in connection with them. I want to take occasion now, Mr. President, to say that hereafter, in view of what occurred to-day, there will be less unanimous-consent agreements for the printing of documents than have been granted in the past. I have not been an offender in that regard. I do not think I have asked to have five documents printed during my membership in this body. I may have asked, possibly, for that number; but I have allowed all kinds of documents to be printed out of courtesy to the Senator making the request.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not undertaken to deny that the practice has been to disregard the statute. I am calling attention to the statute. We have not given attention to it heretofore in the Senate as we should have done. Generally when I have asked permission to print a public document I have accompanied it with an estimate of cost.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. Certainly no estimates of cost have ever been given in

the case of the documents that have come here from the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I think not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I said the other day, Mr. President, that I thought the Secretary of the Treasury had about concluded his privilege in that regard; and I now give notice that when the Secretary of the Treasury makes a political speech again and some Senator asks, either without an estimate or with it, that it shall be printed as a document, it will have to be printed by a vote of the Senate.

If we are to draw the line as it has been drawn to-day, and Senators are to be attacked because they have made a respectful request under the rules of the Senate in good faith, and it has been granted—if that is to be the rule—of course we will have to protect ourselves as best we can against incursions into the Treasury by Senators who have been so conspicuously particular about the revenues of the Government on the occasion that has just been concluded.

I am glad the Senator withdrew the request. I apprehend that he was not consulted about this matter at all by any parties in interest. I apprehend that he simply felt that he was doing his duty as a Senator; and I feel that he ought not to have been attacked or his colleague attacked as they have been because of the fact that under the rules of the Senate he made a respectful request.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say just one word on this matter.

I have before me and over in my office clippings from most of the leading newspapers of the United States commending the objection that I raised to the printing of the temporary chairman's speech in each of the political conventions. I thought it was right to object then. I think so now. The only safe way to do in the future, in my opinion, is to object to every unanimous request to print in the Record and insist that every request for the printing of a public document be referred to the Committee on Printing. We fill the Record with newspaper clippings nearly every day. I tried for months to stop it, but it created such a feeling that I gave it up. I should like some time to have an expression of the Senate on the subject. I think I shall make a poll of the Senate at some time in the near future, and if a majority of this Senate will agree with me that nothing shall be printed in the Record unless it is read into it it will not go in by unanimous consent, and I will guarantee to the Senate that there will not be many newspaper articles read into the Record.

I do not know how to get the matter before the Senate, or I would make the motion now that it is the sense of the Senate that the present practice shall cease. But I know that Senators think it is a personal matter when objection is made to such a request. I say the only safe way to do is to object to them all, to see that no more articles shall go into the Record unless they are read in there, and that no more public documents shall be printed by unanimous consent, but all requests be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I thoroughly and heartily agree with the statement of the Senator from Utah. I want to ask him if he does not think the members of the Committee on Printing should share with each other the responsibility of these objections, and that whoever happens to be present from the committee should object to filing the Record with newspaper articles and speeches and matters of that kind?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, just one word more, and I am through. I entirely agree with the statement made by the Senator from Utah, and I concur in the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona that it should be the duty of the Senator from Utah, as the former chairman of the committee and as senior minority member, to object to this improper material being printed as Senate documents or being put in the Record, and I pledge myself to help him after to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. I promise the Senate that I shall begin to-day.

Mr. PENROSE. I have sat in this body for nearly 20 years, and I think this request to-day is the second one that I have made during that long period to have a Senate document printed. It was made in good faith and with a desire to preserve important information, and the answer to it was offensive language and epithets.

There are two or three Senators here who are persistent and frequent offenders in connection with having frivolous and often ridiculous matter printed as Senate documents. I have sat here patiently for this long period and have perhaps been wrong in permitting this abuse of Senate privilege; but I will stand by the side of the Senator from Utah from this day on and prevent such ridiculous performances as the account of a visit to the tomb of some one over in Scandinavia, and documents

merely full of epithets and abuse, and other improper material being inserted in the Record or in Senate documents.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be proposed, I ask that the bill be reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in gross in all the amendments excepting those reserved by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and other Senators.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think the Chair has included in the statement the reservation that I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair included all reservations by saying "other Senators." The question is on concurring in the amendments to the bill made in Committee of the Whole with the exceptions stated.

The amendments not reserved were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand all the amendments have been concurred in except those reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out, from line 6, page 170, the word "ten," the first word in the line, and insert the word "two"; strike out, from line 9, the words "four of these"; strike out, from line 12, the word "six," the first word in the line, and insert "four," so that that part of the amendment will read:

Two first-class battleships, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action; at a cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$11,500,000 each, to be begun as soon as practicable.

Four battle cruisers, carrying suitable armor and as powerful armament as any vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action; four of these to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$16,500,000 each, to be begun as soon as practicable.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not intend to take more than a moment of time in speaking of the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I wish to call the Senator's attention to his amendment. Would it not be a mistake to reduce the number of battle cruisers to four, in line 9, and then leave the limit \$16,500,000 as applying to them all? It strikes me under the information the committee has it would be a mistake to provide for any number of battleships and leave the limitation as to all of them at \$11,500,000.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not able to hear the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I say, as the amendment of the Senator from Iowa now reads, it would reduce the number of battleships to two, and then the Senator strikes out, in line 9, the word "four." So the section would provide for the building of two first-class battleships, leaving the limitation of \$11,500,000 as applicable to all that were authorized under this section.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota, I think, is wrong. My first amendment changes the paragraph in which it occurs so that it provides for two first-class battleships, at a cost not to exceed \$11,500,000 each. My second amendment, which is offered at the same time, is to reduce the number of battle cruisers to four, the cost not to exceed \$16,500,000.

Mr. CLAPP. I understand that, but my view was that when the Senate committee authorized it they felt it safe to place a limitation of cost on four at \$11,500,000 apiece. It strikes me it might be unwise, if we authorize only two, to leave that limit of cost upon them.

Mr. LODGE. The two remain in the program. I understand the Senator from Iowa allows no battleship for this year; he cuts the program in two, and the two battleships are to be built in three years.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, my purpose is to reduce the program from 10 battleships to 2.

Mr. LODGE. That is obvious.

Mr. CUMMINS. I assume that the sum fixed by the committee, namely, \$11,500,000, is a fair appropriation, or a fair limit, for battleships of this character, so that no change should be made in that regard. It is my purpose to reduce the pro-

gram with regard to the battle cruisers to four rather than to six, but I have no information that would lead me to believe that a greater amount should be allowed for the construction of each of these cruisers than is contained in the proposed amendment by the committee.

I realize perfectly well that if this amendment is adopted there must be subsequent amendments considered and adopted in order to produce entire harmony, but the chief feature of the new arrangement relates to battleships and battle cruisers. If it is the view of the Senate that we ought not to authorize more than two in addition to those already authorized of the dreadnaughts, nor to authorize more than four of the battle cruisers, the subsequent parts of the amendment can be modified accordingly.

In my view, Mr. President, so far as battleships are concerned, my amendment proposes merely the continuation of a policy that has been recognized in the Congress and in the country for years past. It is intended to continue that policy, for, as I said the other day, I think it is an offense against good government for the United States at this time, before the close of the war in Europe, before we know in what condition the world will be at that time, before we know whether the end of the war will promise peace or will indicate war, to change our policy or materially increase our armament so far as battleships are concerned.

It may be—although I hope, Mr. President, it will not be—that when peace again dawns upon a distracted world it will come in such form as to make war the normal condition of mankind, and will advise us that we must stand ready at a moment's notice to engage the powerful nations of the earth. If the conditions at that time bear no other construction than immediate or approaching war for the United States, then I, for one, believe in such preparation as will enable us to meet that contingency successfully. But if the outcome of the war is such that we can reasonably believe that another long period of peace will intervene between the great nations of the world, then I am unwilling to enter upon a competitive program of armament suggested by this bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me that our highest duty at this moment is to preserve our place in the affairs of the earth unimpaired. It seems to me that we ought to be able to approach the powers of the earth untouched, uncontaminated by the infection that apparently has spread all over the world. We ought to approach this climax in civilization ready to lead the world toward peace instead of inviting it toward war.

This is but a repetition of the sentiments I expressed a day or two ago. We will do civilization a mighty injury if we, the most powerful neutral Nation of the world, shall before the event I have described assume the attitude of a warlike and belligerent power.

My amendment reduces the battle cruisers to four. I have always favored a well-balanced Navy. I have long believed, with the little study I have been able to give the subject, that the two points of weakness in our Navy were, first, the lack of swift battle cruisers, and, second, the want of auxiliary or supply ships, and I have always been willing to strengthen our Navy in these regards. But my object in the amendment I have offered is to tell the world that we have not in this juncture—we have not been in this great sweep of disaster that has covered the world—changed our policy, and that we are proceeding as we proceeded before, moved by the same hope and disturbed by no other fear than assailed us then.

I did not feel just this way with regard to the Army. I was willing to see a marked increase in the Army, because I felt that the conditions in Mexico were so unsatisfactory and unsafe that we needed, purely for the defense of the Nation and the maintenance of peace about our southern border, an Army of the magnitude that we authorized in the late bill, although there were some parts of the measure which did not command my approval.

Mr. President, I will keep my promise and no longer consume the time of the Senate, but simply as a notice, I say, in concluding, that I will ask for the yeas and nays upon my amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have been very considerate of all the views of the various Senators in connection with the naval program in Committee of the Whole. I have sought to limit debate as much as possible, but I have not availed myself of an opportunity to lay any amendment on the table except one motion to reconsider, which had been discussed previously. I feel, now that the bill has come into the Senate after debate has been had in Committee of the Whole, that I should avail myself of such parliamentary proceedings as the rules of the Senate entitle me to move to lay amendments on the table.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator from Virginia withhold that motion just a moment? I recognize his right to make the

motion and I do not intend to resent it. While I think it would be very much better for him to allow a vote upon the merits of the amendment itself, yet the Senator must know that in the Committee of the Whole the Senate committee amendment, toward which my proposal is directed, was adopted with scarcely a dozen Senators in the Chamber. It was adopted contrary not to an understanding but in consequence of a misunderstanding. When I left the Senate Chamber to take my midday lunch I intended to offer the amendment, which I afterwards did offer, to the text of the bill before the Senate committee amendment was adopted. I asked a Senator to suggest the absence of a quorum if the question of adopting the Senate committee amendment should arise.

Mr. SWANSON. I will say to the Senator that I have no objection to having a vote on his amendment, unless the debate is prolonged; but, being in charge of the bill, a number of Senators have told me that I have been too forbearing heretofore. They have said I allowed the bill to drift too much. Under those circumstances, I think I ought to urge a vote as quickly as I can. This question has been discussed in Committee of the Whole. I have no objection to a yeas-and-nays vote on the amendment. All I have to say is that, if it is adopted, it destroys the entire program as arranged. Upon this question, Mr. President, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ASHURST (when Mr. BECKHAM's name was called). I was requested to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] has been called from the Chamber on important business, and is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and his pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], but I know from his statement to me that he would vote as I desire to vote. So I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I do not see him in the Chamber and therefore I withhold my vote. The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. He is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], but on questions of this kind I am privileged to vote, and I vote "nay."

I desire to announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] is unavoidably absent and that he is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. DU PONT. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] and vote "nay."

Mr. COLT. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. He would vote as I shall vote on this question, and I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] and let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—14.

Clapp	Jones	Norris	Vardaman
Cummins	Kenyon	Robinson	Works
Curtis	La Follette	Thomas	
Gronna	Lane	Townsend	

NAYS—60.

Ashurst	Harding	Oliver	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Hollis	Owen	Smith, Md.
Borah	Husting	Page	Smith, S. C.
Brady	James	Penrose	Smoot
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Phelan	Sterling
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Stone
Bryan	Kern	Polindexter	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Taggart
Chilton	Lewis	Ransdell	Thompson
Colt	Lippitt	Reed	Tillman
Culberson	Lodge	Shafroth	Underwood
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Wadsworth
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Walsh
Fletcher	Myers	Shields	Weeks
Gallinger	Nelson	Simmons	Williams

NOT VOTING—21.

Beckham	Gore	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Catron	Hardwick	Newlands	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Overman	
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	
Goff	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	

So Mr. CUMMINS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMAS. I move to substitute the House provision, beginning on line 10, page 167, and ending with line 25, on page 169, for the proposed amendment of the Senate committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to submit a proposition to amend the Senate committee amendment. Will the Senator withdraw his amendment for that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. LODGE. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. The amendment is a substitute of the Senate committee's provision for the House provision. The Vice President has well ruled that the question must come on the affirmative proposition as agreed to in Committee of the Whole, which is to substitute the Senate committee provision for the House provision.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely. The Senate committee provision is the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so declares.

Mr. LODGE. It is an amendment to the House text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado withdraws his amendment. He has not offered it.

Mr. THOMAS. I have withdrawn it. I have no wish other than that in some way to record an affirmative vote for the House program. If I can do that in any way, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 170, line 6, strike out the word "ten" and insert "four," so as to read "four first-class battleships," and, in line 9, page 170, strike out the words "four of these."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, this is an amendment similar to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] as applied to battleships or dreadnaughts, only it reduces the number from 10 to 4 instead of from 10 to 2.

I have offered this amendment, as I gave notice that I would do while the bill was in the Committee of the Whole, believing, as I then said, that four battleships were all that could possibly be constructed within the year or the construction of which could be undertaken within that time. It is not proposed that the construction of any more shall be undertaken within the year. Believing, as I thoroughly do, that a revolution in naval architecture may be suggested within a year, or perhaps sooner, that might disarrange all our plans, believing also that the number of battleships I have named will be quite sufficient for any program which we ought to adopt at this time, I have been moved to offer this amendment.

I do not care to delay the Senate with a discussion of the matter, because should I do so I would but repeat what the Senator from Iowa has so well said on this particular subject. I therefore ask, without further discussion, for a vote, unless some Senator wishes to discuss the amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. This amendment proposes to construct no battleships whatever this year, but only to construct four during three years; it reduces the House program; and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator will understand that under the Senate committee amendment the construction of four battleships is to be begun as soon as practicable; and this amendment will not interfere with the beginning of the construction of all the battleships that could possibly be begun if it is not adopted.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I shall take just a moment with reference to this amendment and also as to the question relative to my vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

I am in favor of a strong navy, but I do not think that battleships are essential at this time to a strong navy. I believe when the *Deutschland* sailed into Baltimore Harbor the other day it sounded the death knell of battleship construction, as we will recognize by and by when we come to look at these matters more calmly. This we will do in the near future.

I would rather trust to a fleet of 10 submarines having a radius of three or four thousand miles than to a fleet of 10 battleships. If the one fleet were sent against the other, in my judgment far more submarines would come home than would battleships.

Many of the increases made in the Senate amendment I am in favor of. I want to call attention to exactly what the increases are over the House program. The House program is the largest naval program which has ever been presented. The Senate proposes to give 10 battleships, the House none. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa was as large a battleship provision as in any of our naval bills of the past. The House provided for five battle cruisers; the Senate makes it six. I voted to reduce that number because, even with the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, we should still increase the naval ship program over the House program by one capital ship. The Senator no doubt made that statement; but I did not have the advantage of hearing him.

Mr. SWANSON. That is, for three years.

Mr. JONES. Oh, well, that may be, but I say that is provided for in the bill. These ships can all be contracted for by the President as soon as possible after the passage of this bill.

Mr. SWANSON. That is, for three years' construction.

Mr. JONES. Taking the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], as he stated it, it would require the commencement or the construction of these four battleships within the year just the same as does the Senate provision.

Then the House provision carried four scout cruisers, while the Senate provision carries 10 scout cruisers. I am heartily in favor of that increase. We need more scout cruisers; and this increased number of scout cruisers would round out the Navy which we have and make it far more efficient. So I am in favor of that part of the Senate amendment.

Then, the House provided for 10 torpedo-boat destroyers, while the Senate amendment provides for 50. I think that is a very desirable increase in connection with our Navy, and so I am in favor of that. The House provided for 50 submarines, while the Senate amendment increases the number to 67 or 68, including the Neff submarine, provided for in another paragraph.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. In order that the Senate may understand the statement which the Senator from Washington is making, I desire to state that the program of construction is for three years, and not for one year.

Mr. JONES. Oh, well, we shall have another naval bill at the next session of Congress, and, if it is necessary to go on for three years, we can take care of that in the next bill, that will be here along in February. I would not interfere, I do not interfere, and I do not ask to interfere with the items in this paragraph for the beginning of the construction of these submarines at an early date; in fact, I should prefer to have a provision inserted that every one of them should be commenced as soon as possible. That is what I should like to see done. I am not an expert, but we can use a little common sense with reference to what is an efficient instrument of war. For reasons that are perfectly plain most naval experts will not concede the superiority of the submarine until they have to do so. A layman is just about as able to determine the efficiency of the submarine as an instrument of war as the expert, and their judgment is more apt to be correct in the first instance than that of the naval expert.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I am in accord with the Senator's views, but I should like to inquire whether, in his judgment, it would not also be well to substitute for one of these \$20,000,000 battleships, a number of airships, in addition to those which are provided for?

Mr. JONES. I should be delighted to vote for a proposition of that kind. It seems to me that there is where we are falling down, if we are falling down at all—in not making more than ample, in fact, abundant provision for these new instruments of warfare which have demonstrated their efficiency, namely, the submarine and the flying machine.

Then the House provided for one fuel ship; the Senate provides for three fuel ships. I am in favor of that increase. We need them, and we ought to have them as soon as possible.

I am not in favor of a three or a five years' program. If we need increases in our Navy, let us get them as soon as we can, and not pass them over to a program of one or two or three or five years, which can be changed at any session of Congress, as the Democratic House did in 1912. Congress meets every year and can take care of any situation that may present itself. If we need these things, we need them; if we need them, we ought to have them, and as promptly as possible. Certainly, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] says, if we do not need them now there will be abundant time hereafter to authorize them. Congress will meet again in a couple of months, when we shall have another naval appropriation bill which can make whatever provision may then be deemed wise and necessary. So it seems to me that in this bill we ought to provide for whatever we need, and require it to be commenced and to be finished as soon as possible.

Mr. President, what is the situation? The construction of two of our largest battleships was authorized, I think, about 18 months ago. They have not yet been commenced, and we do not know when they will be begun. This Congress has passed a separate bill providing for the fitting up of two navy yards to complete those battleships. How long it will take to have those yards fitted up I do not know. Those battleships will not be begun until those yards are fitted up.

Mr. President, if that is the way we are going to proceed as to the beginning of the construction of these battleships, we had better quit trying to build up our Navy.

Then we provide for one transport, while none is provided by the House. I think we would have been wise if we had provided for more than one transport.

One hospital ship was provided for by the other House; two destroyer tenders were provided by the Senate and none was provided by the House. I think it is wise to make that provision.

One fleet submarine tender is provided by the Senate, while none is provided by the House. I think it is wise to insert that provision.

One ammunition ship is provided for by the House, and I think the Senate committee has acted wisely in providing for two in the bill.

Two gunboats have been provided for by the Senate, but none has been provided for by the House. If we need gunboats, I think the action of the Senate committee is wise in that respect. I have no opinion as to the need of gunboats, and must take the advice of experts with reference to gunboats and their efficiency, and so forth.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator in reference to the gunboats. We used to have a good many of them, but they are out of date now. I remember, however, a few years ago we used the older ships for targets, and I presume these gunboats are provided for in the bill so as to get active practice for the Navy and to be used as targets for the battleships.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is entirely mistaken. They are used in China and elsewhere, where it is necessary, and they are used on our own rivers. They are absolutely necessary. They are light-draft vessels and can go where larger vessels can not.

Mr. JONES. Here is another provision in the Senate amendment which I heartily favor. It ought to have gone further:

Provided, That the 66 vessels directed herein to be begun as soon as practicable shall be contracted for or shall be begun in navy yards within six months from the date of the approval of this act.

If we need these ships, I believe in putting something into the bill which will hurry up the work upon them, and not have us come here in a year or a year and a half to find that the ships that we have authorized not only have not been constructed, but that their keels have not even been laid. I think that what I have read is a wise provision.

These are, in brief, my views with reference to the Senate amendment and with reference to the House provision. I want a strong Navy, and I want whatever needs we have now

taken care of. I believe in a much larger number of submarines, fast cruisers, and torpedo-boat destroyers. I think the Senate committee has been very liberal in that respect. As suggested a moment ago by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], I should be glad to take the money provided for the building of one or two of these battleships and to put it into flying machines, submarines, and torpedo boats. I think we not only ought to provide for submarines, but that we ought, if we can do it, to offer some inducement that will lead to the highest possible development of the submarine—not that we should merely copy the submarines that have already been built, but that we should offer some encouragement under which their efficiency will be developed and increased. Certainly we have not yet reached the acme of submarine perfection. Our people ought to be stimulated to develop the highest efficiency along those lines.

Mr. President, briefly, these are my reasons for supporting the amendment of the Senator from Iowa and that of the Senator from Michigan. If those amendments are voted down, I shall vote for the Senate amendment. I know it will go to conference, and I know that there are a good many Senators who are in favor of the Senate committee amendment with the idea that the bill will go to conference and be brought out much different from what is passed by the Senate. I am confident that when the bill does come back the result will be more in line with my ideas and my views now than it will be with the views of some of those who are advocating the larger program.

Mr. BRANDEGEE and Mr. OWEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma, so that he can follow directly after me.

I do not desire to debate this question. I simply want to call the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to the article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1916, at page 5074, written by a leading British naval expert, Mr. Arthur H. Pollen. The Senator from Washington puts great faith on the achievements of submarines and thinks the day of the battleship is over because of the success of the German submersible *Deutschland* in arriving at Baltimore Harbor. I ask to print in the RECORD at this point the part of Mr. Pollen's article which deals with the submarine and which I have marked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"The most questionable element in the American program is the very large provision of submarines. Fifty fleet submarines and 85 coast submarines, which are to cost in all nearly \$80,000,000, make a vast hole in the half billion that it is proposed to spend. As it is in many respects the most striking, so in another it is the most difficult item to criticize. The special circumstances of this war and the very extraordinary circumstances which preceded it, have given the submarine an entirely false importance in the public eye. Essentially, the submarine is a variant of the destroyer. Once within attacking range of an enemy it has what the destroyer has not, the power of delivering a daylight attack, remaining itself almost unseen. But invisibility is not a new attribute. The torpedo boat and the destroyer possessed it at night. Their speed enabled them to deliver the equivalent of unseen attack in the dusk. Except that the submarine's invisibility is more complete, it is the destroyer's inferior. It has less speed; it is less strongly armed.

"But its invisibility does give it a function new to naval war. It has the capacity to pass through waters which are absolutely commanded by surface ships, because it can pass them submerged and unseen. Fleets otherwise powerless to enter commanded waters can now enter them with this form of craft. Thus the German submarines have been at large to a limited extent in the English Channel, and with extraordinary freedom in the North Sea, in the western Atlantic, and in the Mediterranean. They have gone, in point of fact, where no German surface ship could have gone at all. British submarines similarly have penetrated the Sea of Marmora and the Baltic. The first and most striking fact about the submarine, then, is its capacity to enter into and operate in waters that are adversely commanded.

"But once in those waters the power of the submarine is extraordinarily limited. Indeed, its capacity to enter those waters can also be limited. The use of nets, of mines, and of patrols—especially when assisted by aircraft—these at any focal point which submarines coming or going must pass, can do much to obstruct their free passage. The narrower the waters, the easier their control by these means. And even in

comparatively open waters great destruction can be and has been done by surface craft upon them.

"But, apart altogether from the dangers to which the submarine is exposed, what is its value when it is at work in hostile waters? It has two weapons, the torpedo and the gun. It can carry but few torpedoes—few, that is, compared with the number of rounds of gun ammunition that it can stow away. The torpedo, too, is an uncertain weapon at the best of times, particularly uncertain when aimed while the submarine is submerged. Wherever it is possible, then, the captain of the submarine has done his work with his guns. But as a gunned ship the submarine is the weakest thing afloat. Hence its guns can be used only against unarmed craft. It dare not approach any armed ship on the surface at all. If it has to approach an armed ship submerged, its speed of approach is greatly limited. The highest submerged speed does not exceed the half-power speed of the slowest warship. Hence high speed and a high standard of vigilance in ships which are armed makes them altogether immune from submarine attack except in the rare cases when, by pure chance, their course takes them within the submarine's striking radius. It was thus, it is supposed, that the *Formidable* was destroyed on New Year's Day, 1915. It was thus that the *Lusitania* fell—if the fact that she was within a yard or two of the course she had taken every time she had ever crossed the Atlantic can be described as chance and not as folly. The point, however, is that if the ship is armed the submarine must keep submerged, and if it keeps submerged its maneuvering speed is low, its capacity to get within striking distance very limited, and its weapon very uncertain. If the ship it intends to strike is both at speed and accompanied by destroyers or fast craft, the area of danger to the submarine and the intensity of the vigilance are increased, and the danger from submarines becomes altogether negligible.

"The success of the submarine against the merchantman is to be explained by the fact that merchantmen being unarmed, the submarine has been able to deal with them as any other armed surface ships would do. The speed of the modern big submarine is higher than that of any but a score or so of the fastest liners, and a single 12-pounder is quite sufficient armament to subdue a merchantman if the merchantman is unarmed itself. If submarine attacks on trading ships become recognized as legitimate by civilized nations, then all merchantmen will be armed, and their case will approximate that of the warship.

"But the most remarkable failure of the submarine in this war is its incapacity to do the one thing which even those who thought least of its capacity took for granted. It has entirely failed in its function of coast defense. The German submarines have been unable to defend either the ports of France, the coast of Gallipoli, Salonika, Valona, or the coast of Egypt from the allied battleships and transports. The explanation is simple. It has not been able to interfere with the transport and disembarkation of troops, because these operations have been carried out in waters superficially controlled by the fleet to which the transports belonged. What the submarine could do in defending a coast in waters superficially controlled by its own side will probably never be proved. These are not the conditions in which intending invaders send their armies across the sea. Had the Germans been mad enough to try to land a force in England, I have no doubt that British submarines, acting without any fear whatever of destroyers or other fast craft, could have accounted easily for every transport that got past our battleships, our cruisers, and our destroyers. But I have, if it is permissible to say so, still less doubt that any transports would ever have got past!

"The root of the matter seems to be this: If you command the seas with surface craft, the rôle of the enemy submarine is limited to being a somewhat inefficient guerrilla. It can waylay peaceful merchantmen, just as the highwaymen of old in England held up travelers and "bad" men in America have occasionally held up trains. But it has not taken any such toll of British shipping as the privateers took in olden days, and, like the privateers, it has been absolutely incapable of interfering with military communications where the surface is efficiently commanded. In this matter the British submarines have entirely eclipsed the German. Both in the Sea of Marmora and in the Baltic our successes against transports have often been greater in a single week than the German submarines' against our transports in the whole campaign.

"A foolish and most unfortunate statement of the British Admiralty in January, 1915, had attributed to submarines an importance that they never possessed. It was said that the British fleet desisted from the attack on the Germans at the

Dogger Bank because of the presence of underwater craft. I am persuaded that no British admiral could ever have made this excuse—and survived. If enemy submarines are observed at sea, it will no doubt be necessary to avoid passing within range of them. But a suddenly discovered mine field or a well-planned torpedo attack from destroyers each would have exactly the same effect. It would impose upon the commander of a battleship squadron a sudden and, perhaps, a large and violent change of course, but it would be no excuse for flight. If such an excuse were admitted, it would be tantamount to saying that submarines could sweep the sea.

"What is the application of these considerations to the American program? I suggest that the principles to bear in mind are these: The more certain you are of commanding the sea against your adversaries, the more useless submarines will be to you. If you command the seas, you will not want them for coast defense. If you do not command the seas, they will not defend your coasts. They will not help to win command of the sea. You will hardly want them for attacking the enemy's trade, for you are too far from the focal points of any enemy's trade to be able to maintain submarines upon them.

"Take it for all in all, I suggest—while Mr. Daniels's program shows no sign of the idiotic absurdities about submarines that have been put forward on this side—nevertheless, it has been influenced by the great effect the submarine has had on the public and professional imagination. And this leads me to my concluding point.

"It is impossible to get any large change of policy carried in this country unless public opinion is instructed and educated in the issues and principles involved. The same conditions no doubt prevail in America, and may prevail to a still greater extent. But it must be remembered that the details of naval programs are not fit matter to be settled by public acclamation. The scale of the program is certainly so. The objects for which the navy is to be built are so, but the details manifestly are not. If the American statesmen and the American public can agree together as to the standard of strength that their Navy ought to attain, there is only one sound way of insuring that that strength is attained and at the smallest sacrifice. It is to leave the details to be decided by the best expert opinion that your Navy can produce. Remember that you want experts on a great many subjects. Remember also that to put yourselves into the hands of an individual expert is not the only way, and seldom the best way, to secure the best results. The general knowledge of a great service like the American Navy is more extensive, and its judgment is saner, than that of any single man, however gifted he may be. Remember, too, that the criticisms of those who use the things that are provided is far more valuable than the suggestions of those that make them. The program is quite silent as to expenditure on methods, and yet the methods of using weapons are of far vaster moment than the size or power or cost of the weapons themselves. The provisions of a navy is certain to be bungled if it is not guided by the best strategical and tactical brains you have. And the strategical brains will be misled unless they have mastered tactics, and the study of tactics can not begin until the art of using weapons has been brought to perfection.

"If the occasion of a great naval program were made the occasion for organizing a well-proportioned naval staff—not a staff for executive administration, but one for dealing with all naval problems from the point of view of right theory and scientific practice—then a result would be produced far greater and more valuable than can be got by any mere provision of inert and costly things. It is, after all, on the men, and not on the ships, that you rely. See that they have the ships, guns, methods, plans, preparations, training that they ask for.

"ARTHUR H. POLLEN."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, on February 24, of this year, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] made these observations on the subject of child labor, which I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, page 3054:

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there is simply one question I am going to ask. I am interested in the Senator's discussion of the matter.

Which was a discussion of the child-labor bill by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENTON]:

Yesterday I received a letter from a very prominent citizen of my State, a man who has the esteem of our entire citizenship, in which he very calmly discussed this matter. He asked me, it is true, to vote against the bill.

Mr. KENTON. Is he a manufacturer?

Mr. GALLINGER. He is a manufacturer without guile.

Mr. KENTON. There are those, I know.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; he has a large establishment that never has had a strike, and where he has the most contented class of men that could be conceived in his employ. He made this point, that if this legislation is constitutional on the ground that it is detrimental to children to work under certain conditions, may the next step not be that it is detrimental to the health of men to work 10 hours in some establishment where they are only working 8 hours in another establishment, and whether we may not go to the point to say that we have a right, based upon the theory of this legislation, to exclude from interstate commerce goods produced by men who are working 10 hours, or probably 12 hours a day, and in that way doing detriment to their health and very likely to their offspring?

That was the point raised, and I should like to ask the Senator, in all seriousness, if that is not a possibility?

Mr. KENTON. I am very glad to answer the Senator as best I may, though I doubt very much whether the man who suggests a question like that to the Senator could be absolutely without guile.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator knew the man he would agree with me that he is a man who holds to the highest ideals of proper life in every regard.

Mr. KENTON. I want to answer the Senator's question fairly. Of course he could have gone further and asked if Congress could go to the extent of saying no article shall be shipped as interstate commerce unless it is produced by a colored man in the light of the moon, and so forth.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think that is a fair comparison. He puts it on the point that it was a detriment to health. They very seriously argue in certain quarters that men ought not to work more than eight hours. Indeed, I observed that a gentleman haranguing an audience in Boston Commons said a little while ago that no human being ought to work more than six hours a day. It was upon that basis my correspondent submitted the matter to me.

Mr. KENTON. Now, let me answer the Senator, since he propounded the question. First, the power to regulate commerce is limited by the fifth amendment. If a bill could be passed here providing, as the Senator's friend suggests, that no goods shall be transported in interstate commerce from a factory where men work over eight hours, when they get to the Supreme Court they must take up the general situation of the country as bearing upon reasonableness what the States have done about it, what the sentiment is in the country, and what effect that has upon the country as bearing on the question, whether it is reasonable or unreasonable, whether it is arbitrary or not, and if unreasonable and arbitrary, it is unconstitutional.

That is the best answer I can give. So the Senator can group all that he might ask under that rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that I propounded the interrogatory more particularly for the reason that I propose to send my friend the very able speech which the Senator has made, and I will go further and say that, as a layman, I had very seriously wondered whether this proposed law is constitutional or not. I remember that when Senator Beveridge was so eloquently discussing it, the leading lawyers of this body at that time said to me it was unconstitutional clearly. But I go further and say that, as at present advised, I propose to vote for the bill, leaving the question of its constitutionality to be determined by the courts. I asked my question in entire good faith.

Now, Mr. President, I find according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I ask the Senator the date of that colloquy?

Mr. HARDWICK. February 24 of this year. I find, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, that during the morning hour yesterday the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire made these observations:

Mr. President, I am quite solicitous that the bill that is now under consideration—

That is, the naval bill—

shall be considered as speedily as possible, as there are so many other matters of important legislation that of necessity will come before this body. One of those matters is the child-labor law, which most of the Senators, if not all of the Senators, on this side of the Chamber warmly favor. We desire very much, indeed, that before adjournment shall be taken that important measure shall receive the careful consideration of this body.

Mr. President, personally, of course, I make no criticism of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his change of position. It seems that on February 24 the best opinion he had was that this measure was probably unconstitutional, although he was inclined, being a layman, to be willing to vote for it and to submit the question of its constitutionality to the courts.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think the Senator puts that exactly as the RECORD shows it. My remembrance is that the Senator from New Hampshire stated that he was, as a layman, going to vote for the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. I said that, precisely.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator to say that the Senator from New Hampshire was inclined to vote for it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I read it exactly from the RECORD. I do not want to characterize the Senator's remarks, because I have read them in connection with mine, and they will speak for themselves. The Senator did say then that as at present ad-

vised, indicating that he had no certain position on that question, being a layman, he intended to vote for the bill, although the best information he could get from lawyers was that it was clearly unconstitutional. He recalled that when Senator Beveridge so eloquently presented that measure in this Chamber some years ago all the lawyers of any standing or importance in this body thought it was unconstitutional.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator will examine the RECORD, he will notice that the observation of the Senator from New Hampshire was made long before the Senator from Iowa had concluded his argument. I think we may well suppose some effects from his able argument.

Mr. HARDWICK. No. I should like to make that concession for the benefit of both Senators or of all Senators; but the argument of the Senator from Iowa, which, by the way, was a very eloquent, persuasive, and able one, had gone far enough to let the Senator pretty clearly catch its drift.

Now, of course, the mere fact that lawyers like the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Iowa are inclined to believe this measure is constitutional gives it some little standing in court indeed; but for that it would have absolutely none, as both Senators know.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. When I was told a few minutes ago that the Senator from Georgia was discussing a question which interested me I assumed that it was this very question, and my reply to the messenger was that the Senator from Georgia is so good a friend of mine and so fair-minded a man that I knew he would say nothing that the RECORD did not bear out. Now, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me, I will make a very brief statement; it will take but a few moments.

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator, of course.

Mr. GALLINGER. When this matter was before the Senate, and advocated and urged with great ability by ex-Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, the lawyers in this body at that time, on whose opinion I depended to a very great extent, as a rule, stated to me that they believed it to be an unconstitutional measure. That had great weight with me. Most of those lawyers have left the Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will let me interject a remark there, I believe they were absolutely right, and the Senator had better stick to what they said.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish merely to add a few additional words. Since that time I have found a change of opinion on the part of some men who at that time held that this was an unconstitutional measure, and one notable instance is a Member of this body, who a little time ago said to me that he would vote for the bill, notwithstanding that he had held heretofore that it was unconstitutional. That has had considerable weight with me; but I think, Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia will agree with me that as a layman, knowing absolutely nothing about law except what I have absorbed as a Member of this body—and sometimes I think I know nearly as much as some other Senators who claim to be lawyers—I think that as a layman I took precisely the right ground when I said that whatever doubt there might be in my mind I should vote for the bill and leave its constitutionality to be tested by the courts—and I take it for granted that it will reach the courts in due time if we pass the bill—and upon that statement I stand to-day. I do really entertain the opinion that it is a very grave question whether this act will be constitutional or not, but my opinion would be worth so little that I, of course, would not urge it here or elsewhere. That is all.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, the Senator is quite right in assuming that the Senator from Georgia would not do the slightest injustice to the Senator from New Hampshire, his position, or his motives about this or any other matter. There is no doubt about that. I do not want to make any mistake in the Senator's position, especially to his disadvantage.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there have been a great many changes of opinion with reference to the constitutionality of the child-labor bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is the Senator one of the changes?

Mr. BORAH. No; I can not say I have changed for I am not entirely free from doubt now, but the distinguished leader of the Senator's party has undoubtedly changed his mind.

Mr. HARDWICK. Who?

Mr. BORAH. The President of the United States.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, the President of the United States. Has he changed his mind about this?

Mr. BORAH. The President in one of his lectures on constitutional law in 1911 stated his opinion as follows:

Its power (the Federal Government) is "to regulate commerce between the States," and the attempts now made during every session of Congress to carry the implications of that power beyond the utmost boundaries of reasonable and honest inference show that the only limits likely to be observed by politicians are those set by the good sense and conservative temper of the country.

The proposed Federal legislation with regard to the regulation of child labor affords a striking example. If the power to regulate commerce between the States can be stretched to include the regulation of labor in mills and factories, it can be made to embrace every particular of the industrial organization and action of the country. The only limitations Congress would observe should the Supreme Court assent to such obviously absurd extravagances of interpretation would be the limitations of opinion and of circumstance.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, the book he wrote on that subject is right.

Mr. BORAH. I do not call attention to this by way of criticism, for it is a subject which has been very near the border line with a great many constitutional lawyers, and some lawyers, instancing the President and others, who have entertained the view that it was unconstitutional have come to the conclusion now that it is constitutional. I do not think that much can be gained by assailing the Senator from New Hampshire, a layman, even if he has changed his mind in view of the distinguished precedent which he has for his action. It is very probable that these changes by lawyers have been by reason of certain opinions which the Supreme Court of the United States has lately rendered.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I have given careful consideration to all of those opinions, and personally I have not been able to come to any such conclusion as that; but did the Senator from Idaho start with the idea that this legislation was constitutional or unconstitutional? At the time the then Senator from Indiana, Mr. Beveridge, for instance, discussed it, did the Senator from Idaho then believe it was constitutional?

Mr. BORAH. I did not have the good fortune to hear the Senator from Indiana, and I do not now recall that I have ever examined his argument, but I will say that prior to the rendition of the opinion by the Supreme Court in some late cases I would have been of the opinion that this bill now on the calendar was unconstitutional. I am not wholly without doubt now, but in view of those opinions I am frank to say I have modified my views. I would not vote for any bill, however meritorious I believed it to be, if I believed it to be unconstitutional, but if there is a reasonable doubt as to its being unconstitutional, or if the court seems to have laid down principles upon which it can be sustained, and I believe it meritorious, I feel free to vote for it. That is the way I view this bill at the present time.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will not take time now, Mr. President, because I do not want to delay the pending bill, to go into the discussion raised by the last suggestion of the Senator from Idaho, although later I expect to discuss that very question with the Senator and before the Senate.

Personally, of course, I make no assault upon the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his evident change of heart about this measure, so far as he has changed his heart about it. Assuming, however, that he spoke on yesterday for his party and as its leader upon this floor, it is evident, plainly and indisputably evident, that the purpose of the Senator and his party is to play party politics or to attempt to do so on this great question.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator is not quite fair in making that statement. I have no such purpose, and have had no such purpose, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. Then why did the Senator put that in the RECORD yesterday?

Mr. GALLINGER. Simply because I had a bundle of telegrams coming to me from all over the country in favor of this bill, and a dozen or more letters—

Mr. HARDWICK. On the 26th day of February the Senator was very doubtful about this bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. And the best he could say about it then was that it was of doubtful constitutionality. Now, how does the Senator explain that? What has happened since then to make the Senator so anxious to have the bill passed at this session?

Mr. GALLINGER. Because I think the people of the country want action on it. That is the only reason.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right.

Mr. GALLINGER. The people I try to represent certainly are anxious about it; and I want to say to my good friend, the Senator from Georgia, that I am quite willing to take a vote on this bill without a word of debate, and I hope we will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right. I am just expressing my opinion as to what this action means on the Senator's part, with the apparent approval of all his colleagues on the other side.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I simply wish to suggest to the Senator that both great political parties have indorsed a child-labor bill in their platforms.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will come to that presently. I would rather not yield further right now.

I deeply regret and deplore the adoption of such a course by the Senator and his party, yielding to influences that need not be specified here, although they were plainly named in the current press dispatches, the conventions of both political parties have in their recent platforms declared in favor of the principles embodied in this bill, though not in favor of the pending bill specifically. That such a course should have been adopted by either convention in reference to a policy the constitutionality of which is seriously questioned and strongly challenged is, I think, most regrettable.

Of course such action can have no influence upon the vote or conduct of a Senator who entertains the views that I do and who has no doubt whatever that the proposed bill is in express violation of the Constitution of our country. As a Member of this body, I have sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and not the party platform.

That the Congress has the power, under the flimsy pretext of regulating interstate commerce in an article of trade that is admitted of a perfectly legitimate character and inherently sound, to actually and really control such purely local and domestic questions as the hours and conditions under which labor may be employed in the several States, is so monstrous a proposition that I can not for a moment entertain it. If such a doctrine be established here and upheld by our courts, then our dual system of government is destroyed, and our people will have lost the inestimable blessings of local self-government, so dear to the Anglo-Saxon heart and so essential to the preservation of individual liberty.

That the proposed bill is flagrantly and patently unconstitutional I hope to be able, at a later date, to show, both to the Senate and the country. While I favor just as strong and just as humane legislation on this subject as any Member of this body on either side can possibly favor, yet I do insist that such legislation can only and should only be enacted by the several States of the Republic.

This legislation is not only of grave importance in its economic aspects, but it is also of momentous import to the country and to the people in the preservation of their constitutional system of government, for it is the boldest attempt in the entire history of the Republic to destroy and break down the rights of the States, to demolish the symmetry of the American system, and to utterly disjoint the balance between State and Federal power.

It has been my opinion, therefore, that the measure could not possibly be given that consideration that its great importance not only justifies but demands during the present session, if the Senate is to conclude its labors and Congress is to adjourn within a reasonable time. I still entertain that opinion, and believe it would be far wiser to give this measure careful consideration when we reassemble here in December next. Whether it is to be considered during the present session or later, I can not abate in any particular or to any degree my own fixed and unalterable opposition to it; but, Mr. President, I am unwilling to see my party assailed in any such way or for any such purpose as is indicated by the latest remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire; and it is therefore perfectly satisfactory to me, so far as I have a voice in the matter, for the Senate to take this bill up before the end of the present session, provided only reasonable opportunity is afforded under the rules of the Senate for a discussion of this matter consonant with its great importance.

Let me say, Mr. President, in this connection, that I earnestly believe and urge that we ought also to have an early opportunity to consider, before this session shall end, the bill to restrict immigration, a measure that is not only favored by more than two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress but also by a vast majority of the people of this country.

Mr. BORAH subsequently said: Mr. President, I referred to some extracts in my remarks to-day. I ask leave to insert them in the RECORD in connection with what I said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Georgia I desire to ask if I would be in order in preferring a unanimous-consent request at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair can not pass upon that question until the request is made. The Chair thinks it is in order.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator would have to have the roll called first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator to state his request.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to submit this request for a unanimous-consent agreement—

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Idaho not to do anything of that sort. We want to get rid of the naval appropriation bill. If we take up something else, we will be here all day.

Mr. BORAH. It will not take five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will please state his request.

Mr. BORAH. I want to request unanimous consent that upon the final disposition of the naval appropriation bill we take up what is known as the child-labor bill and proceed to dispose finally of the original bill and any amendments that may be offered, and that the debate shall be limited to 12 hours on each side.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I can not consent to any extraneous matter being injected into the consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. JONES. On that I ask for the yeas and nays, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 170, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "10" and insert "4," and on the same page, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the words "four of these," so that it will read "four first-class battleships."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made before, I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and its transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to inquire whether the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have a general pair with that Senator. I understand, however, that if present he would vote as I will. Therefore I cast my vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], who is absent; but I feel released from that pair on the present vote. I accordingly vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I make the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, and vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], whom I do not see in the Chamber. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] and will allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—15.

Clapp	Jones	Norris	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Overman	Vardaman
Curtis	La Follette	Robinson	Works
Gronna	Lane	Thomas	

NAYS—58.

Ashurst	Fletcher	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Gallinger	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Hardwick	Page	Smoot
Borah	Hollis	Phelan	Stone
Brady	Husting	Pittman	Swanson
Brandeggee	James	Poin Dexter	Taggart
Broussard	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Thompson
Bryan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ransdell	Tillman
Chamberlain	Kern	Reed	Underwood
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lewis	Sherman	Walsh
Colt	Lodge	Shields	Warren
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	
du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—22.

Catron	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Newlands	Sterling
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Goff	Lippitt	Penrose	Weeks
Gore	McCumber	Saulsbury	
Harding	McLean	Shafroth	

So Mr. TOWNSEND's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I move on line 6, page 170, to strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "six"; and on line 9 of the same page I move to strike out the word "four" and insert the word "two."

I am not going to discuss the amendment, any more than to say that it would reduce the number of first-class battleships to six, and provide for the commencement of two of them as soon as practicable, instead of four.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, and vote "nay."

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Repeating the transfer I made a little while ago, I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made on the preceding vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made on the last roll call with regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], and to announce his pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Clapp	Kenyon	Robinson	Vardaman
Cummins	La Follette	Shafroth	Works
Curtis	Lane	Thomas	
Gronna	Norris	Townsend	
Jones	Overman	Underwood	

NAYS—58.

Ashurst	Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harding	Owen	Smoot
Borah	Hardwick	Page	Sterling
Brady	Hollis	Pittman	Stone
Brandeggee	Husting	Poin Dexter	Swanson
Broussard	James	Pomerene	Taggart
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Thompson
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed	Tillman
Chilton	Kern	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Sherman	Walsh
Colt	Lewis	Shields	Warren
Culberson	Lodge	Simmons	Weeks
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—20.

Catron	Hitchcock	McLean	Phelan
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Newlands	Saulsbury
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Goff	Lippitt	Penrose	Sutherland
Gore	McCumber		Weeks

So Mr. KENYON's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NORRIS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on page 170, I move to strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive, and to insert instead of the word "six," on line 12, the word "five," that being the House program with regard to capital ships.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 170 it is proposed to strike out the provision as to battleships, lines 6 to 11 and in line 12, before the words "battle cruisers," to strike out "six" and insert "five."

Mr. THOMAS. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator from Colorado if he will not reach the same result if he asks for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment of the committee?

Mr. THOMAS. No. I will have to vote "nay" then, and I want to vote "yea" for the program of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. But that does not include all of the program of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. It does as to capital ships.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is all, though.

Mr. THOMAS. That is what I want.

Mr. NORRIS. The balance of the program—

Mr. THOMAS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLT (after his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and its transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made by me on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement regarding my pair and transfer, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED. Making the same announcement as on the last vote as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. BRYAN (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—12.

Bankhead	Curtis	La Follette	Underwood
Clapp	Gronna	Norris	Vardaman
Cummins	Kenyon	Thomas	Works

NAYS—65.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Overman	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hollis	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Husting	Page	Smoot
Brady	James	Phelan	Sterling
Brandeggee	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Stone
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poin Dexter	Swanson
Bryan	Jones	Pomerene	Taggart
Chamberlain	Kern	Ransdell	Thompson
Chilton	Lane	Reed	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Wadsworth
Colt	Lewis	Shafroth	Walsh
Culberson	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Weeks
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Williams
Fletcher	Myers	Simmons	
Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	
Harding	Oliver	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—18.

Catron	Hitchcock	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Newlands	Sutherland
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	O'Gorman	Townsend
Goff	Lippitt	Penrose	
Gore	McCumber	Saulsbury	

So Mr. THOMAS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 167, line 12, after the word "constructed," insert "two first-class battleships, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, at a cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$11,500,000 each, to be begun as soon as practicable."

And, before the words "battle cruisers," in line 12, strike out "five" and insert "four," so as to read:

For the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to have constructed two first-class battleships, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, at a cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$11,500,000 each, to be begun as soon as practicable, and four battle cruisers, carrying suitable armor and as powerful armament as any other vessel of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and the greatest desirable radius of action, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$15,000,000 each.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, this is a proposed amendment to the House text. I shall be but a moment in presenting my views in regard to it. It is my present purpose to vote against the amendment proposed by the committee, but I am not fully satisfied with the House provision. I should like, if possible, to be permitted to choose between the House provision authorizing 2 battleships and 4 cruisers, than to choose between the House provision of 5 cruisers and the Senate provision of 10 battleships and 6 cruisers. I have therefore sought to change the House bill in the part which is sought to be stricken out by the committee amendment so that it would authorize two battleships and four battle cruisers.

I have nothing further to say about it, because I am fully persuaded that the temper of the Senate is in favor of unlimited armament and unrestricted expenditure of the public money for this purpose. I ask for the yeas and nays upon my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD obtained the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will; and then I want to say something.

Mr. STONE. I desire to direct the parliamentary inquiry for information. We adopted a little while ago, did we not, an amendment reducing the number of battleships from 10 to 8?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me, this is an amendment to the House provision and not to the Senate amendment. That will come on the substitution of the Senate amendment for the House text. By doing this we simply hamper the conferees and prevent making any arrangement between our program and that of the House.

Mr. STONE. But if this should be agreed to by the Senate, would it increase the number of battleships to 12 or reduce the number proposed by the Senate committee?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; if this amendment is adopted the House provision will then authorize two battleships and four cruisers, and if then the Senate votes against the Senate committee amendment that will be the action of the Senate. If, of course, the Senate afterwards adopts the Senate committee amendment we will then have 10 battleships authorized and 6 battle cruisers.

Mr. SWANSON. It is in an indirect way to accomplish what we have already voted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. SWANSON. We have already voted as to whether we would adopt the Senate committee program for this year providing 10 battleships and 4 battle cruisers. The House provision is for five battle cruisers and no battleships. We have already voted to reduce the battle-cruiser program of the House and to build 10 battleships. This is simply a repetition of what we voted upon half an hour ago.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is a point of order raised against it?

Mr. SWANSON. No; I do not raise the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment. I want to repeat to the Senator from Virginia we have not voted upon this proposition. We voted against reducing the program of the Senate committee from 10 to 2 and from 6 battle cruisers to 4.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the difference was as to the authorization that is recommended by the President and indorsed by both parties. There is now provision made for three years' construction.

Mr. CUMMINS. We have not voted, as I look upon it, on any such question. There is no difference between the four authorized for this year and the six which are not authorized, because the six may be contracted for to-morrow if this bill should pass.

Mr. SWANSON. I want the Senate to understand that the Senator made a motion to eliminate entirely the authorization for two years. Then he made a motion to reduce the construction to two years. All this does is to reduce the House authorization from five battle cruisers to four.

Mr. CUMMINS. It seems to me the Senator from Virginia ought to favor the amendment I have now proposed. It increases the program of the House by two battleships and only diminishes the program of the House by one battle cruiser. If it should happen that the Senate sees fit to approve the House program, rejecting the committee amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia, we would have, from his standpoint at any rate, a better program than we will have if the Senate rejects the committee amendment and leaves the House provision to stand as it is. Logically he ought to vote, and I suppose he will vote, for my amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, as I understand the proposition before the Senate, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa seeks to amend the language of the House provision and not the Senate provision; that the House provision now carrying five battle cruisers the amendment of the Senator from Iowa will make the House provision carry four battle cruisers and two battleships.

Mr. President, I have not taken any part in this debate because I am not on the Naval Committee, and I do not consider myself an authority on the question. I am in favor of reasonable preparedness. I am not one of those who believe that we can trust the country to love and faith; but I do not think we ought to put on the American people an undue burden, a burden that it is unnecessary for them to carry.

I feel that in the construction of the first line of battleships we are taking many chances. These battleships may be in commission a decade before they go to the scrap heap. Within ten or a dozen years they undoubtedly will be out of commission if the precedents of the past govern the future.

But, aside from that, in the changing conditions of naval warfare these first-class battleships and cruisers may all go to the scrap heap by new naval construction putting them out of business within the next year or two. But I do not say that that is an argument why we should cease building ships entirely. We must build some ships. We must keep a Navy up to a standard that will reasonably protect us in case we are involved in a foreign war, and I am willing to vote for an amendment of that kind.

Now, as between the Senate program of 10 battleships and 6 battle cruisers, 16 ships of the first order, and the House provision of 5 battle cruisers, 5 ships of the first order, I intend, if I have an opportunity to do so, to support the House provision. But I intend now to be more liberal than the House provision. I am willing from my own standpoint to decide the question in a liberal way and accept the amendment of the Senator from Iowa by voting for it, which will cut off one battle cruiser and in place of it put in two battleships.

If we come to that proposition, we will be constructing that this year and authorize the construction, and as the Senator from Iowa has just stated, it does not make any difference whether we make the appropriation this year or not, if the contract is made. The Senate committee bill authorizes the contract to be made for 16 first-class ships. When the contract is made Congress can not revoke the order; we will have to build them and pay for them whether they are out of date or not. I think in the temper of the times we can safely rely on the fact that if we authorize the contract to be made it will be made before the ides of next March. I think it would be impossible to fill the contract at this time. The boats will not be built, the money will not be appropriated for them at this time, but if the contract is made and in the course of the next two or three years we find out we are not building these ships in the right way, that they are not available in modern warfare, and that contingency may happen any day, the contract is made, the indebtedness is created, and the American people must pay for it.

Now, is not the House provision more businesslike? The House provides for building five first-class battle cruisers this year—a very large increase over the program we have had in the past. Last year or the year before we limited our first-class ships to one ship a year. For a few years preceding that we built two. But most of the time they were ships that only cost one-half of the amount that a first-class ship costs to-day.

The House provision is not drifting out into the indefinite and unknown future. It is not authorizing a contract for the building of ships the utility of which may be in great doubt before the contract is delivered. But the House is providing for five first-class ships to be begun now, and letting the Congress of next year and the Congress of the year following determine

what kind of ships it will build in those years, instead of binding the Government to a contract to-day that we may be sorry for to-morrow. I think that is the wise provision. It may not limit this program. It does not necessarily limit the program. The Senator in charge of the bill has just stated that it is not the intention to build all these 16 first-class ships this year; but under the stress and the whip of an existing sentiment we are asked to tie the Government's hands for the future so that this contract can not be changed.

I take it if we build five or six battleships now we will take that step toward preparedness that will be equal in every respect to the Senate provision so far as this year is concerned, and then we leave to the next Congress to determine, when they have the facts behind them and not before them, as to whether the next step is advisable.

Therefore, I intend, if I have the opportunity to do so, to support the House provision for the building of these first-class battle cruisers rather than the Senate provision, but I desire to be liberal about it. The Senator from Iowa seeks to amend the House provision. He seeks to take away from the House provision one battle cruiser and to add two battleships, and although I do not believe in reckless and extravagant appropriations for war expenditures, I am going to try to be reasonable about it. I am going to err on the side of safety in what my judgment tells me. Therefore, I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa because I think it is a better-balanced amendment than the House provision. If the Senator does not succeed in passing it and the issue comes with the House bill as against the Senate committee bill, I shall then support the House provision, which has been carefully considered by a great committee, with experts before it, with the administration aiding it, who reached the conclusion that these five ships are enough for this year, and that next year and the year after it will be left to be decided by the men who are in Congress at that time.

I think that is the wise point from which to look at this question, and I think in a spirit of liberality we can well afford to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. The program as presented in the bill as reported to the Senate was prepared after consultation with the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the General Board of Experts of the Navy, and the heads of the various departments. The President had recommended a building program in accordance with what most nations had adopted. Japan has a building program extending to 1922, I think.

This program has the approval of those who have considered the matter. The General Board of the Navy have examined it, and they have recommended 4 battleships and 4 cruisers. Japan, as I understand, and as her minister has stated, has a building program for this year of 4 battleships and 4 cruisers of the latest type, and if her finances would permit, she would build this year 4 additional, which would make 12. Those who have had the responsibility of the control of affairs are satisfied that we could not have a shipbuilding program smaller than this. If this building program is accomplished, we still should not have the second navy in the world, but would only have the third navy.

I have the name of every battleship from Naval Intelligence, its size, shape, and so forth, and we are satisfied that this program, recommended and indorsed by the administration, by the General Board, and sustained by the Navy Department, will furnish us a navy which will give us safety and security. It would be useless to build a bridge which does not extend across a river. You had better build no bridge.

We believe that when this program is completed it will mean peace; it will mean no war. We believe, considering the losses that Germany and other nations have already sustained and will sustain, that we shall soon have the second navy in the world, and we believe that it will afford an absolute guaranty for peace. With that view this program has been recommended for the indorsement and support of those who favor an efficient and adequate Navy.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Virginia a question if he will permit me.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to the Senator doing so.

Mr. CUMMINS. If my amendment were adopted, the House provision would be better than this one, would it not?

Mr. SWANSON. It would.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator vote for my amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not favor the House provision. It does not provide for enough destroyers. I am not in favor of a provision in preference to that of the committee, and I will not aid it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then the reason why the Senator from Virginia will not vote for my amendment, I take it, is that he is afraid that if the committee amendment were so amended it would be accepted in preference to the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement I made a little while ago in reference to the transfer of my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] to the Senator from New York [Mr. O'Gorman], I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the former roll call, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I make the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the former vote and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLean] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hitchcock] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—19.

Bankhead	Curtis	Lane	Thomas
Brady	Gronna	Newlands	Townsend
Bryan	Hardwick	Norris	Underwood
Clapp	Kenyon	Oliver	Works
Cummins	La Follette	Overman	

NAYS—61.

Ashurst	Husting	Phelan	Smoot
Beckham	James	Pittman	Sterling
Borah	Johnson, Me.	Polindexter	Stone
Brandeggee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Swanson
Broussard	Jones	Ransdell	Taggart
Chamberlain	Kern	Reed	Thompson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lewis	Shafroth	Vardaman
Colt	Lodge	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Walsh
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Warren
du Pont	Myers	Simmons	Weeks
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gallinger	Owen	Smith, Ga.	
Harding	Page	Smith, Md.	
Hollis	Penrose	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—15.

Catron	Gore	Lippitt	Saulsbury
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Fall	Hughes	McLean	Sutherland
Goff	Lea, Tenn.	O'Gorman	

So the amendment of Mr. CUMMINS to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the committee amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I desire to move an amendment. On page 170, line 4, I move to strike out the date "1919" and insert in lieu thereof "1921," so as to read:

For the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake prior to July 1, 1921, the construction of the vessels enumerated below:

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of talk about a naval program and the fact that Japan has a naval program extending to 1922. I believe in a reasonable naval program, and, therefore, I do not believe in concentrating all this construction in three years.

In the first place if all these ships are constructed in three years they will not have the modern improvements that come from experience acquired when one ship is built after another. It takes three years to construct a battleship, and hence all of the 16 capital ships will have to be commenced immediately. While too long an extension of the time might be detrimental to the best interests of the Navy, the extension of the program to five years, it seems to me, would be advantageous. To construct all these battleships and battle cruisers within three years would mean practically that they would be of the same type of each class, and on that account we ought to have a five-year program instead of a three-year program.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if this program is to cost \$500,000,000, the tax upon the people, if spread over five years, will be \$100,000,000 annually instead of \$166,000,000 a year if all the construction is completed within three years. That, it seems to me, is something which we ought to take into considera-

tion in determining whether we shall spread out this program or concentrate it within the period of three years.

It is said that the Congress of the United States in the past has been sporadic in its naval appropriations, providing for a large number of ships one year and the next year omitting to provide for any additions to the Naval Establishment. That, of course, is not wise. But, Mr. President, I am afraid that is what will happen under this large bill. If we adhere to this program of three years, there may be another similar large program for the ensuing three years, while if we extend it to five years another extension for the following five years would not be so burdensome on the people, and that would be much better than an extension and duplication every three years.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it would be safe to say, in view of past experiences, that within the next two years it will be claimed that the Navy constructed by these enormous appropriations is not a navy at all; that it is inefficient; that it is weak; that we will still be in a position to deserve and receive the contempt of all the great armed nations of the world, and a still larger program will be insisted upon in the interest of preparedness.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, he is entirely mistaken. No one claims that these battleships will be useless. I do not see how the Senator got any such misconception as that. The battleship of 11,000 tons and carrying 11-inch guns is still effective against a battleship of the same class, carrying guns of the same size.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. But when other nations increase the size of the guns carried by their battleships to 14 inches we have to meet them. Our battleships, carrying 12-inch guns, are not useless, however. They are effective against battleships of the same class in the other navies of the world. The Senator is mistaken in saying that they would be useless. Of course against guns that shoot twice as far and carry twice as much weight of metal that would be true, and that is what makes necessary to a large extent the increase in our Navy.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I believe the Senator misapprehends the object of my remarks. All I am calling attention to is the propaganda that is constantly being carried on for the purpose of securing these large appropriations. If the Senator has kept up with preparedness literature in any degree, as I have tried to do, he has long since discovered the fact that it is the claim that our present Navy is useless; that it is nothing but a collection of vessels that should go to the scrap heap. I know that that is not true, just as the Senator does, but I am satisfied that before this program shall have reached its consummation the same charge will be made against the mighty battleships and battle cruisers provided for in this bill; and the Congress will be told that preparedness is still like the mirage of the desert, something that we can see but never reach.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, whether they go to the scrap heap or not, battleships are considered, after a period of 10 or 12 years, to be obsolete, or, at least, to be largely obsolete. I do not want 16 great naval vessels to become obsolete practically at the same time. That is the objection which I have to the plan proposed. If this program is made to extend over five years, there will be more care and deliberation in the planning of the ships. If they are all to be built within three years, it will require quick, hasty action in order to get them ready, and they will practically be all of the same type.

Mr. President, I do not want to detain the Senate. I believe it is wiser to spread this program over five years. I believe it will be better for the Navy, better for each ship, and better for the people who have to pay for these great battleships; and I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not prevail. This program has been fixed at three years upon the advice of the most scientific and best-informed men in the Navy. It seems to me, if we need the ships, we need them as soon as they can be constructed, and those who are most familiar with naval matters concur in that opinion. I hope that the amendment will not prevail, as it will disarrange completely the program.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, just a word. The program, of course, could not bind another Congress, but it is well to define the policy. If Senators will examine it, they will see that it is by no means an excessive one. Spread over three years, it means three battleships a year. Generally we have built about two a year. It provides for two battle cruisers a year, and we all recognize the great defect of our Navy is that it has no battle cruisers. If this program is changed to five years, it will then be wholly inadequate and will not meet our situation or our necessities.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the effect of the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] is practically to reduce the proposal for increasing the effective strength of the Navy. It proposes to string out over five years what otherwise would be done in three years and for which other appropriations would be made in the future if it were not for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I am extremely gratified that the Committee on Naval Affairs has decided upon a program. There have been indiscriminate and contradictory appropriations in the past. I introduced a resolution on August 15, 1913, known as Senate concurrent resolution No. 7, asking that the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, or any subcommittees thereof, acting jointly or separately, should inquire:

First. What increase is desirable in the Naval Establishment.

Second. Whether it is desirable and feasible to provide a definite naval program, to extend over a series of years, with respect to the construction of new ships.

Third. In what order the United States Navy ranks among the first eight naval powers in naval efficiency, in view of the number, type, age, armor, and armament of its ships and the quality, skill, and discipline of its personnel.

Fourth. What proportion of our naval fighting efficiency is constantly available for instant active sea service in case of emergency.

The Committee on Naval Affairs made no report upon the resolution, and on the 9th of October of that year I called it up in the Senate and asked for some information from the committee. The committee had not considered it and did not consider it. If the committee had considered that resolution at that time and had conducted that investigation, we would have been just about three years ahead in the preparedness of the Navy.

Mr. President, I have always favored a strong Navy, and I think the stronger we maintain our Navy the smaller Army we will be compelled to support.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, does not the Army appropriation bill call for as much money as the naval bill—\$330,000,000?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not yet seen the Army appropriation bill. Whatever it does require would not be inconsistent with my statement. I say that by as much as the Navy is stronger, by so much can we reduce the Army.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree with the Senator thoroughly. I have always supported a strong Navy ever since I have been in the Senate; but I agree with him that we do not need as large an Army program as a naval program.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the situation was that we had determined upon a regular building program of two battleships each year, and in 1912 the House of Representatives, having become Democratic, departed from that policy and passed a bill providing for one battleship and sent it over here. The Senate committee proposed an amendment increasing the number to two, and the department sent a letter over here, which I am going to read to the Senate in just a minute, as it will take only a few minutes. I moved to raise the number to three battleships; and upon that motion, on a ye-and-nay vote, on February 28, 1913—as will appear on page 4312 of the Record of that year—21 Senators voted in favor of three battleships. Of this number only two were Democrats. If we had authorized those three battleships then, three years ago, the Navy would have been that number ahead at the present time.

What did the department do? Here I find a very short statement from the Navy Department, which was put into the Record by Senator Perkins, who was chairman of the Naval Committee at that time. I will read it:

FEBRUARY 27, 1913.

The President has declared that "Until peaceful means for settling all international controversies are assured to the world, prudence and patriotism demand that the United States maintain a Navy commensurate with its wealth and dignity."

This additional battleship is essential to our peace and prosperity. It is required if we would maintain our national prestige and is a part of the assurance of our national integrity. Its building, rather than being an expense to our people, should be regarded as a source of income in that its fabrication will furnish employment for thousands of workmen in practically all the allied trades throughout the entire country.

The command of the sea can only be attained through adequate navy.

A battleship requires approximately three years for its construction. In time of actual or impending war the entire wealth of the United States would not permit of the purchase of such a vessel in the markets of the world.

The United States, with its wealth, its extensive coast line, the Panama Canal, the Monroe doctrine, can not be the first of the great world powers to deliberately reduce its naval strength; to do so is but to invite disaster.

The 13-inch guns of the *Oregon*, *Massachusetts*, and *Indiana*, and the 12-inch guns of the *Iowa*, *Kearsarge*, and *Kentucky* are of low velocity and short range when compared with batteries of the modern dreadnaught. In a fleet action these vessels of ours would be annihilated by the modern high-powered vessel fighting from a range that would render them practically immune to any of our 12-inch or 13-inch shells.

By January 1, 1917, Germany will have 26 dreadnaughts in commission and the United States only 15, even if two are now appropriated for.

In spite of the recommendation of the department, only one dreadnaught was authorized by Congress that year.

Mr. President, a navy becomes efficient in two ways: First, if it is strong enough, it scares people from attacking you; second, if you have to fight, by having your Navy strong enough you can whip your enemy. On that point, which seems to me to contain some common sense, I desire to read to the Senate a brief paragraph which appears on page 4428 of the Record of this session, under date of March 20, 1916, which is by Arthur H. Pollen, the British expert. He says:

The strength, then, of the Navy that America requires must be dictated by the combined strength of the nations whose hostility to American policy and American ideals there is reason to fear. It is a question not for naval experts but for statesmen to settle. When it is settled, the equivalent of the Navy required may, to a great extent, be determined by arithmetic. Relative battleship strength is the first point, though it is not the only one. When a list has been made of the powers that may become enemy, add their battle fleets together, estimate what their strength is likely to be at any future date, and provide the battleship strength necessary for meeting it. With two final observations I shall leave this part of the subject. The General Board and Mr. GARNER want a navy equal to the strongest maintained by any single power. If this is an intelligible, it is also a large and costly policy. But remember that it is not so costly as failure to have adequate naval strength when the time of trial comes. Secondly, if you want a successful naval war, provide a force at least 40 per cent greater than that you are likely to meet. If you want an exciting naval war, provide one which is approximately equal. But a navy which is smaller in numbers and less in power than that of the probable opponent is demonstrably worse than useless. It is useless because there seems no rôle at all for an inferior fleet. It neither protects nor enables you to attack. And it is worse than useless, because to possess a great fleet which is not great enough to fight successfully is a waste of treasure and effort and men in time of peace and a source of bitter humiliation in time of war.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator give the page from which he is reading?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is page 5075 of the Record of this session—March 20, 1916.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of philosophy talked upon this subject. The Senator from Iowa yesterday afternoon indulged in a disquisition which embraced the contests which have taken place among civilized nations since the days of Greece and Rome. I do not mean that he did it tediously at all. He did it very entertainingly. But, Mr. President, to draw inferences from previous contests and attempt to apply them to the future, and to regulate your conduct according to them, and stake your all and your future on the theory, the mere guess, that your judgment may be right, is not a safe thing for this Nation to do.

Of course, nobody wants war if he can keep out of it. I do not believe, and I do not believe that anybody else in this country, at least, believes, that we are building a large fleet or increasing our military strength in order to take advantage of any other nation. In my view, we are building it to protect our own rights, to protect our own citizens and their property, and to guarantee that this great democracy—the only great and free one in the world, apparently, so ideally situated to perpetuate itself if it be left alone—shall be perpetuated, and no chance shall be taken about it.

Why, Mr. President, if people believe that there is no possibility of our having to have a war with another nation, I can not understand how they vote for any navy at all. It is a pure waste of money to have any.

When I vote money for building these fighting ships, I am voting that money to build those ships with the idea that some day they may—although I hope they will not—have to fight. That is what they are—fighting machines! I am under no illusion that I am building them to promote good will and peace on earth, except as peace can be promoted by the fear of attacking us. I am building them to protect this country in its rights and to perpetuate this Nation, and if it is necessary to fight to do it, I am willing to do it with the last ounce of vigor and the last gun and the last man in this Nation—and I glory in that attitude.

Some people seem to feel ashamed, if some bandit comes along and threatens their life or their property, to protect themselves. Well, I am not; and I do not think he is a true American who wants to stake the future of his country upon the proposition that he will not fight. I do not believe that the pacifists when they were attacked would stand on their theories. I think they would fight for their homes and their firesides and their native land as courageously as anybody else. They may think they would not, but they would, because they are human.

Therefore, whether you will have an effective Navy, whether you vote "yes" or "no" on this bill, depends upon your guess as to whether you are ever going to need one or not. I hope the people who say we are in no danger and never will be are right. If so, we will have lost the interest on some money;

but if they are not right, and we make this provision, we will have saved our country. If they are right, we would have paid so much for insurance. If they are wrong, and we do not have the insurance, the democracy of the world has lost its highest exemplification, and the future would perhaps never be able to restore liberty as we have known it and enjoyed it.

Now, take your choice. Either have no Navy at all or let us have an effective one. I want it strong enough so that there will be a large margin of safety. What is a hundred million dollars for a few more battleships if it decides the fate of the world at the critical minute?

Mr. President, we have been very lucky as a Nation. We have had no serious contests with the more powerful nations of the world. Whenever we have had a war with Great Britain their attention has been diverted and distracted. They have been attacked on the flank and had to confine their attention to European affairs, so that we have won more by the fact of practically having Europe as our ally than through our own unaided efforts.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] yesterday afternoon, in his very able speech, from his own point of view and those authorities from which he read, seemed to think, if I gathered his idea correctly, that because our coast defenses at certain fixed points were up to date, therefore there was no possibility of an invasion of this country. Why, Mr. President, those coast defenses may be perfectly effective where they are located, but they do not prevent an army from landing in this country. There are many points where they could land which are not protected at all. Only the large cities and strategic points are protected. Canada is entirely unfortified on both coasts, and so is Mexico; and any foreign power could land an army on either coast of either of those countries and march right across an unprotected border. Then of what avail would our coast defenses be, stationary as they are, at New York and San Francisco and other fortified points, with their guns on fixed emplacements?

Of course, the more effective the coast defenses are at any particular point, the more that point is avoided by the invader, if there be one. Now, will there be one? I do not know. I hope not. I think very likely it would take great courage and a great inducement for a foreign power to attempt to invade this country. But, my friends, we have seen remarkable things in Europe in the last two years, which we never would have believed before. Some people think that when this war is over it will mark the end of all danger from Europe and Asia for all time. They say the present belligerents will be exhausted and their treasures depleted. Why, Mr. President, after we had fought in this country for four years, the greatest war up to that time, we were not so depleted but that when Maximilian was on the throne in Mexico in 1865, and he was warned out, the proudest empire in Europe had to withdraw their army. Nations can be pretty well depleted in their treasures, but if they have an organized and trained army of veterans, and a naval escort for them, as somebody is going to have when this war is over, they have all the more inducement to come and collect where they can collect and to fill their depleted treasury.

"Oh," somebody says, "that would be the act of a buccaneer." What is going on in Europe to-day? What is going to go on, when terms of peace are made, in the way of demand for indemnities, and things of that kind? We have seen Japan and Russia make war upon each other almost to the point of extermination, and within a few years we see Russia more powerful than she ever was, with armies in the field now which she did not dream she could raise when she fought Japan, and with Japan more powerful on the sea and on the land than she ever was. Both of them are in debt, yes; but are they powerless because they are debtors?

The pacifists and that school which is trying to leave this Nation unprotected, or not sufficiently protected, seem to think that we are never going to assert anything that will get us into trouble.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who spoke yesterday, alluded to the way in which Germany had been confined and thwarted in her efforts to successfully expand and acquire the necessities for her industrial development, and he intimated, if I understood him correctly, that restriction by the enemies of Germany was largely the cause of the great war that is going on now.

Mr. TAGGART. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. TAGGART. In the amendment, just before the point where the amendment of the Senator from Colorado applies, it reads:

For the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake prior to July 1, 1919, the construction of the vessels enumerated below.

Does the Senator understand by that language that they are to be completed within five years after authorization?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. By or before that period. It undertakes their construction. It takes three years to build them.

Mr. TAGGART. But the point I am trying to find is if we authorize the President to undertake the construction prior to July 1 or after the passage of the bill. The money is appropriated to begin the construction of those ships and they are to be completed within a period of three years.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. TAGGART. The question is at what period of time after the passage of this bill and the appropriation could they commence the construction of these battleships?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think under the language of the bill they could begin at any time. If the Senator will look down at line 10, it provides that four of these are to be begun as soon as practicable. I suppose it is not possible for Congress to fix the exact date upon which work may be begun. They have first to advertise and get bids, and then there has to be an acceptance of the bids if they come within the authorized price.

Mr. TAGGART. I was wondering if the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado, if his amendment was adopted, it would still give them an opportunity to build them just as fast as they could, to be completed in that time, namely, five years, and in the meantime, if it was found necessary, as they progress they could be built faster.

The reason why I asked the question is that I am figuring that there are not enough shipyards in the country to build them all at once or in three years, and within a period of five years it would make it a little easier on the taxpayer.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I get the Senator's idea, but if the Senator is at all correct in his assumption, and I have heard other Senators say it also—to wit, that these ships could not be begun, owing to the limitations of the shipyards—the danger which the Senator apprehends would not occur.

But, Mr. President, if I can help to influence it, even to the small extent of my own vote, I want to see the Government committed to a building program which will amount to something. There is no means of knowing exactly down to the fineness of one ship whether your fleet is going to equal or exceed that of the enemy's fleet. I want to make assurance doubly sure. The expert naval critic from whom I read a few moments ago states that there ought to be 40 per cent margin of superiority to have anything like assurance. We all know the dangers to these great vessels by internal explosion, and when it takes three years to construct a vessel of this kind what would happen if you chance to get the worst of the first fight and lose half a dozen of the large units of your fleet. It might decide the fate of the whole war unless you have some surplus strength.

I want to see these first-class ships constructed as rapidly as possible and put in commission. I have no fear that the program is too large, Mr. President; and I hope that the Senate conferees, if it is passed, will stand by the action of the Senate and will not yield to the House in the attempt to reduce this program. There is too much at stake, Mr. President.

As I was about to say when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART] asked me the question and temporarily diverted me from what I had in mind to say, when this war is over and these nations are hungry, bankrupt, those former enemies, or certain sections of them, are sure to become friends again.

The alliances of the European and Asiatic powers are shifting sand. Japan is to-day helping to finance Russia and sell her war material, when a few years ago she was like a tiger at her throat. Great Britain and Russia, which were hereditary enemies, are now allies, fighting their former friend, Germany. At the close of this war, with all the restraints torn down, with international law made a "scrap of paper," with the wreck of Europe lying at their feet, there is nothing at all to prevent Germany and Japan, if you please, or any other European nation, making an alliance with an Asiatic nation, and we may be driven to fight on both coasts of this country.

Do you want to take the chance? Suppose they decide not to touch us, but to go and take Mexico or South America, to get their mineral fields there and to develop their industries, and instead of preying upon each other over there, to take South America and exploit it and develop it. Where do we come in with our Monroe doctrine? Mr. President, we must either defend it or drop it. What should we do without a navy? How could we hold the Philippine Islands without a navy? We must either defend them or abandon them.

There is nothing more probable than that if the Teutonic allies win this war they will pay no more attention to the Monroe doctrine than they would to a Massachusetts blue law. If the Teutonic allies are powerful enough to vanquish the entente allies, they are powerful enough to take South Amer-

ica under the present preparedness condition of the United States. With the United States having its historic policies and having its views about foreign relations, and being pretty free to assert them, having its commerce upon the seas and its export and import trade to maintain and protect, and its "open-door" policy in the Orient to maintain, who is to say that when we make demands upon foreign nations they are always to be complied with, because they want our respect or our brotherly love?

I want to see this Government powerful enough to maintain its own life and its own honor, and, Mr. President, I am willing to disarm whenever the other nations disarm. But we have proposed over and over again to other nations to disarm or to restrict their armament. None of them would think of doing it. It is an idle dream, therefore, for us to think about doing it until they will do it also.

So, Mr. President, once for all I want to say that I shall vote against every amendment which proposes either to lengthen the number of years through which this construction shall be extended or to reduce the ships authorized. I am sorry that this bill does not contain proper provision for a general staff of the Navy, for I think that is greatly needed, and I do not think the restricted authority given to what is known as the "Chief of Naval Operations," with 15 assistants, at all meets the necessity for an expert comprehensive "general staff" for the Navy.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask that the amendment may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OWEN in the chair). The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 170, line 4, strike out the date "1919," and insert "1921."

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of the transfer of my pair that I did before, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made a little while ago, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer that I did on the former vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH. I transfer my pair as before stated and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bankhead	Kenyon	Norris	Underwood
Clapp	Kern	Robinson	Vardaman
Cummins	La Follette	Shafroth	Works
Gronna	Lane	Sterling	
Hardwick	Martine, N. J.	Taggart	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Thomas	

NAYS—57.

Ashurst	Fletcher	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gallinger	Page	Smoot
Borah	Harding	Penrose	Stone
Brady	Hollis	Phelan	Swanson
Brandegee	Husting	Pittman	Thompson
Broussard	James	Polindexter	Tillman
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Townsend
Chamberlain	Jones	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Reed	Walsh
Clark, Wyo.	Lewis	Sheppard	Warren
Cole	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams
Curtis	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	
Dillingham	Oliver	Smith, Ga.	
du Pont	Overman	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—17.

Catron	Hitchcock	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Newlands	Sutherland
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	O'Gorman	
Goff	Lippitt	Saulsbury	
Gore	McCumber	Shields	

So Mr. SHAFROTH's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SWANSON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I did before in regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made on a prior roll call, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. Making the same announcement as on a former vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. REED. Making the same transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I am requested to announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—61.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Page	Smoot
Beckham	Hollis	Penrose	Sterling
Borah	Husting	Phelan	Stone
Brady	James	Pittman	Swanson
Brandeggee	Johnson, Me.	Polindexter	Taggart
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Thompson
Bryan	Jones	Ransdell	Tillman
Chamberlain	Kern	Reed	Townsend
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lewis	Sheppard	Walsh
Cole	Lodge	Sherman	Warren
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Weeks
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, Md.	
Harding	Owen	Smith, S. C.	

NAYS—15.

Bankhead	Gronna	Myers	Underwood
Clapp	Kenyon	Norris	Vardaman
Cummins	La Follette	Robinson	Works
Curtis	Lane	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—19.

Catron	Gore	McCumber	Saulsbury
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	McLean	Shields
Culberson	Hughes	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Goff	Lippitt	Overman	

So the amendment was concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on concurring in the amendment of the Senate made on page 175.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I reserved this amendment for a separate vote, hoping that the previous amendment might be modified in some way. We have not been able to modify it or to change it in any respect, and therefore I shall not offer the amendments to the committee amendment on page 175 which I had in mind at the time the reservation was made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not propose to prolong this debate. Nothing will change the result here in the Senate at this time. I rise now, however, to ask leave to incorporate in connection with the observations which I submitted on this bill yesterday certain printed matter, extracts from books, and certain tables, which I did not then take the time of the Senate to read and which I do not care to take the time of the Senate to now read if I may have permission to print them in connection with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah gave notice to-day in relation to printing—

Mr. SMOOT. Not when the request is to print certain matter as a part of a Senator's speech. There is no objection to that.

Mr. PENROSE. I have no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It would not take very much to induce me, you know, to proceed now to read the matter into the Record.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator from Wisconsin desires to do so, I shall insist on my objection; otherwise I shall withdraw it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wisconsin is agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has withdrawn his request for a separate vote on the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole on page 175.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still in the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I merely tender an amendment to remedy an omission. I move, on page 20, line 7, to strike out the sum "\$80,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$140,000" in the appropriation for the naval training station on the Great Lakes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 20, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the sum "\$80,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$140,000," so as to read:

In all, naval training station, Great Lakes, \$140,000.

Mr. LEWIS. The failure to recommend that sum was purely an error. It is merely with the object to remedy that that the amendment is offered, so that the station there may be continued.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand there was some mistake in regard to that matter, and I will accept the amendment for the consideration of the committee of conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is agreed to, without objection.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the amendments on page 4, as I understand, were adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. That disposes of all the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read the third time?

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. VARDAMAN, and others called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations before the bill is passed. First, I wish to say that on yesterday, in some way or another, I mislaid a document which I received from the Navy Department to be inserted in the Record with the other matter which I desired inserted in reference to armor plate from the Manufacturers' Record. I now ask that the paper which I send to the desk be inserted in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The document referred to is as follows:

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, July 20, 1916.

HON. B. R. TILLMAN,

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TILLMAN: In compliance with your request for certain information in regard to the armor-plate question, I am inclosing herewith a letter from the Bureau of Ordnance with appendices A, B, C, D, and E.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

[Inclosures.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C.

From: Bureau of Ordnance.

To: Navy Department.

Subject: History of Midvale Steel Co.'s entry into armor manufacture and of the Midvale Steel Co.'s manufacture to date.

1. On August 10, 1901, the Midvale Steel Co. made its initial bid on armor. This was the lowest bid submitted, but was not accepted. The Midvale Steel Co. had no plant at that time, but proposed to commence deliveries 26 months from date of contract. The Midvale Steel Co. protested on nonacceptance of its bid (copy of protest attached, marked "A"; copy of department's action attached, marked "B").

2. In October, 1903, the Midvale Steel Co. bid on armor, was the lowest bidder, and was awarded its first contract. The contract called for a little more than one-third of the total armor called for by the Government. On this contract it was found that the Midvale Steel Co. could not deliver certain armor by the time that the shipbuilder desired it. The Midvale Steel Co. relinquished 614 tons of the armor, which was subsequently manufactured by the Bethlehem Steel Co. There was nothing to show that this armor would not have been delivered on contract time, but the bureau gave it to the Bethlehem Steel Co. in order to avoid claim for damages for delay from the shipbuilder. (See H. Doc. No. 351, 58th Cong.; copy attached, marked "C." Midvale average price bid, \$397; Carnegie and Bethlehem, \$450.60.)

3. In January, 1905, the Midvale Steel Co. was the lowest, the prices being the same as in 1903. The Navy Department appointed a board of naval officers to examine into the facilities

of the Midvale Steel Co. for making armor, and as a result of the report of this board the department awarded but 1,000 tons to the Midvale Co. (Correspondence shown in H. Doc. No. 351, 58th Cong., copy attached, marked "C.")

4. In July, 1906, the Midvale Steel Co. was the lowest bidder and received a contract for one-half the armor; the remainder of the armor was divided between the other two manufacturers at the Midvale price. Midvale average price, \$344.50; Carnegie and Bethlehem, \$365.50.

5. In 1907 the Midvale Steel Co. was the lowest bidder on a specified tonnage. The department considered the other bids more advantageous, but awarded one-third of the armor to each manufacturer at the price of the lowest bidder. (See Appendix D.)

6. In November, 1908, the Midvale Steel Co. was the lowest bidder by a slight margin and received a contract for one-third of the armor. Midvale average price, \$449.75; Carnegie, \$472.50; Bethlehem, \$451.

7. In August, 1909, the Midvale Steel Co. was the lowest bidder by a slight margin and received contract for one-third of the armor. Average price, same to all, \$478.

8. In December, 1910, bids were identical from all companies, except that Carnegie bid \$10 lower per ton on class C armor. There was a slight difference in the bids on class E armor. Each manufacturer received contract for one-third of the armor. Average price, same to all, \$504.60.

9. In January, 1912, bids were identical, except for class B armor; each manufacturer received the contract for one-third of the armor.

10. In February, 1913, bids differed by a few cents per ton; armor was divided equally among the three manufacturers, at the price of the lowest bidder, the Midvale Steel Co.

11. In August, 1913, bids were opened for battleship No. 39. All companies submitted identical bids, which were the same as the price paid for armor under the contracts of the previous year. Revised bids were requested by the Navy Department and were submitted. The Midvale Steel Co. was the low bidder and was awarded contract for all the armor. They subsequently sublet one-third of this armor to each of the other manufacturers.

12. In October, 1914, bids were opened for armor for battleships Nos. 40, 41, and 42. At the request of the Navy Department, the manufacturers submitted new bids on October 26. On that date the Midvale Steel Co. bid \$427 per ton for class A armor for one ship. The department (Appendix E) offered the Midvale Steel Co. \$425 per ton, which was accepted.

13. In September, 1915, armor bids were opened, and the Carnegie Steel Co. was the lowest bidder by \$10 a ton. Contract was awarded the Carnegie Steel Co. at \$425 a ton, the same price as paid under the preceding contract. The Carnegie Steel Co. sublet one-third of the armor to each of the other manufacturers.

CHAS. B. McVAY, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

EXTRACT FROM REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR YEAR 1900.

On June 18 last the department gave notice throughout the country, by public advertisement, for bids for armor, naming August 10, 1900, for opening them. On that date they were publicly opened at the department. There were three bidders for armor and two for armor bolts and nuts.

The bids for armor were the Carnegie Steel Co. (Ltd.), of Pittsburgh, Pa.; the Bethlehem Steel Co., of South Bethlehem, Pa.; and the Midvale Steel Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.

The first two companies each bid the same, with the stipulation that their bids were for one-half the total quantity called for, and were not to be considered for any less quantity, deliveries to commence in six months.

The Midvale Steel Co. made a sliding scale of bids for varying quantities, qualifying their bids with a statement that none were to be considered unless the company received an order for 20,000 tons, deliveries to commence in 26 months.

The armor first required—namely, 7,250 tons for the *Maine* class of battleships now under construction—manifestly could not be procured from the Midvale Steel Co., as it has no armor plant, and the department could not wait 26 months for first deliveries, which was probably sooner than they could have been made. While, therefore, the Midvale Steel Co. was the lowest bidder, its bid could not be availed of with respect to the armor required for the *Maine* class. Its bid was, however, practicable for armor other than that thus required; but if an award to that company were made the bids of the Carnegie and Bethlehem Cos. would necessarily, under the conditions accompanying them, be lost to the department.

Hence, the only way to obtain armor for the *Maine* class, under the bids as submitted, was to make an award of all the

armor to the Carnegie and Bethlehem Cos., which were the highest bidders, or to give it all to the Midvale Co. and wait until the latter company could produce it. Neither of these alternatives was expedient, and consequently all the bids were rejected.

Notwithstanding these facts, the department, in view of the good standing of the Midvale Steel Co. and the fact that it was the lowest bidder, was disposed to award to it some of the armor not required for a considerable time, if satisfactory arrangements could be made with it as to quantity and price, and with the other bidders as to supplying the remainder. To this end a call was issued for a conference of the three companies with the department, to take place October 2. They all announced their intention to be present. On the day appointed, however, no representatives of the Midvale Steel Co. appeared, but a communication was received from its attorneys stating that the company, which had, after the rejection of its bid, filed an appeal insisting on an award, withdrew its appeal and did not desire to be further considered in connection with the matter. Representatives of the Carnegie and Bethlehem Cos. appeared, and, they being the only bidders remaining in the field, negotiations were opened with them.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., October 9, 1914.

The MIDVALE STEEL CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa.
(Via Naval Inspector of Ordnance.)

Reference: (a) Proposals for armor for battleships *California*, *Mississippi*, and *Idaho*, opened on the 7th instant.

Inclosure (herewith): (a) Copy of this letter for naval inspector of ordnance.

SIRS: 1. The department and the bureau had expected a material reduction in the price of armor, in consideration of the fact that the department's requirements at this time were so large as to keep all of the armor plants at full capacity for over a year. This has not been the case heretofore, and if the prices paid were fair ones under the scant orders formerly given, those bid on the 7th must be in excess of a fair price, since the circumstances under which the new armor must be made are more favorable as to cost than has been the case heretofore.

2. The Secretary would be pleased to consult a representative or representatives of your firm on Monday next, October 12, at 1.30 p. m. in regard to the armor bids.

Respectfully,

J. STRAUSS,
Chief of Bureau.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 19, 1914.

The MIDVALE STEEL CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

SIRS: The department has determined to hold the award of contract for classes "B" and "C" armor in abeyance for the present.

It is requested that your company consider carefully the question of Classes "A1" and "A2" armor and submit, by letter, your lowest supplementary bid for these two classes by the 26th instant, in order that the matter may be finally determined.

Respectfully,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

THE CARNEGIE STEEL CO. (LTD.),
GENERAL OFFICES, CARNEGIE BUILDING,
Pittsburgh, Pa., November 11, 1896.

JOHN G. A. LEISHMAN, President.

DEAR SIR: In our respects of June 23, 1896, we stated that as soon as a meeting of our principal partners could be held that we should advise you further in reply to your favor of June 13. This meeting has just been held, and as the result thereof we beg to state that we regret to be compelled to decline any request you make, but believe that upon due reflection you will see that it is impossible for us to open the details of our private business to the eyes of our competitors and to the world.

The cost of making armor is not to be found in the details at the shops, upon which your officers have estimated. Permit us to show you three, among the many elements of cost, which they did not take into account:

First. The capital we have invested in our armor plant is, as stated by our Mr. Carnegie in his evidence before the Senate

Naval Committee, fully \$3,000,000. We charged to this account in our books only \$2,500,000, the amount paid out; but we ourselves contributed fully \$500,000. No charge was made for the ground, railway connections, etc. The water supply is taken from our other works; so also are the electric light and power currents; no charge was made for the proportion of these plants necessary for the armor-plate plant. We charged nothing for superintendence, nor for interest during construction. All of these are legitimate charges and bring the total cost up to something over \$3,000,000.

We began making armor plate in October, 1891, and have made to August 1, 1896, 11,039 tons of armor. The interest upon our investment, \$180,000 per year, in five years amounts to \$900,000, or \$81.53 per ton of armor.

Second. The estimate made by your officers took no account of maintenance of plant. This can not be estimated at less than 5 per cent per annum, which makes \$150,000 per year, or for five years \$750,000, amounting to \$67.94 per ton of armor.

Third. The armor plant is practically useless except for the making of armor, therefore when the Navy is finished, say, 10 years hence, we have to face a probable loss of the cost of the plant, \$3,000,000. Even if the salvage amounts to \$500,000 we have a loss of \$2,500,000, equaling in 15 years \$166,666 per annum, or \$75.49 per ton of armor.

This will make items of cost which were not taken into account in the estimate of your officers as follows:

Interest on plant per ton of armor.....	\$81.53
Maintenance of plant per ton of armor.....	67.94
Loss by abandonment of plant when Navy shall have been completed per ton of armor.....	75.49
	\$224.96
To the above should be added the cost of working capital, which varies greatly, as works may be run fully, partially, or not at all; but estimated at \$1,000,000 average the cost is per ton, say.....	25.00
Making a total of.....	249.96

It is because of these and other facts that we do not hesitate to say that the manufacture of armor is not, and can not be made, a permanently satisfactory investment of capital even at the prices charged per ton.

We did not seek the Government order for armor; the Government sought us; and after declining when invited we finally agreed reluctantly to undertake the task, simply because the Government could not get armor for the ships which were upon the stocks waiting for it.

If the Government now desires to undertake the manufacture of armor for itself, we shall only be too happy to sell our plant to it at cost. It is in splendid order, and we refer you to your experts as to whether it is not far more efficient now than when new, as we have continually made improvements upon it.

The plant can remain where it is, and we will undertake to furnish the steel in the ingot at a price to be fixed by three arbitrators, or we will remove the plant and erect it at any point designated by the Government; also erect the additional plant for the making of the steel. We will superintend this and start the works, and continue to operate them until they produce armor successfully, and for all this we will only ask the Government to pay the actual cost.

We undertake also to teach the Government officials how to make such armor as we are now supplying you, which, as you know, holds the world's record.

Having gone into this business primarily to help the Government when it could not obtain armor, we submit to you and to Congress that we have some claim upon the Government to take our plant at cost, and we hope this proposition will meet with favor.

We make about 150,000 tons of finished steel per month and the two or three hundred tons of armor we make per month demand greater attention and give more trouble than all the 150,000 tons. We shall be delighted if the Government will let us out of the armor business. We can use the capital in several lines of our business to better and permanent advantage.

Yours, truly,

THE CARNEGIE STEEL CO. (LTD.),
JOHN G. A. LEISHMAN, *President*,
By L. S. PHIPPS.

To Hon. HILARY A. HERBERT,
Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Naval Committee and as a Senator from South Carolina, I have naturally felt deep interest in whatever concerns the Charleston Navy Yard, and have done all I reasonably could for its development since its establishment. Naturally, too, all items relating to the Charleston yard in this appropriation bill are looked

on with suspicion and keen interest by all Senators, both those who are interested in the Navy and others. I hope the Senate will listen to me patiently while I explain and justify what is being done for the Charleston Navy Yard in the appropriation bill we have under consideration. The impression has been tried to be created—and the statement has often enough been circulated to gain credence in some quarters—that the Charleston Navy Yard is on shallow water, unapproachable, and badly located originally, and has only been kept alive by Senator TILLMAN's influence in the Senate. Its enemies outside of Congress—and some inside—have been numerous and very vicious and unscrupulous in their attacks on it. The ignorance about this yard is lamentable, although the facts are in public documents and easily accessible to anybody not too lazy to look for them. Some people prefer to repeat the lies they have read rather than seek the truth and learn for themselves what are the facts and real conditions.

The Charleston Navy Yard is located on the Cooper River, 5 miles above the city of Charleston, which is itself 7 miles from the entrance to the harbor, making the yard 12 miles from the sea. It is entirely landlocked and the entrance to the harbor is defended by forts which would make it impossible for any battleship to approach near enough to shell either the city or the yard. It was located by a board of naval officers, and the history of its location and the causes for its being transferred from Port Royal can be found in Senate Document No. 86, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session. So much for that.

The Coast Survey charts will show that there is deep water all the way from the bar, 12 miles away, to and above the navy yard, but there are two mud banks opposite Drum Island and a sharp bend in the channel above it which render dredging necessary in order for battleships to reach the yard without running the risk of getting aground. This was contemplated when the yard was established. The House of Representatives incorporated \$175,000 in this bill, before sending it to the Senate, for dredging Cooper River, and the Army Engineer's Report (H. Doc. 947, 61st Cong., 2d sess.) shows that for this money the two mud banks can be removed and a channel provided through which the largest battleships we now have or are ever likely to build can steam to the navy yard from the open sea without a tug at any stage of the tide. The facts in regard to this item were presented by Mr. WHALEY, the Representative from the Charleston district, and the arguments were so strong in their character and the proof so indisputable that the item was included in spite of the solid opposition of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, under Mr. SPARKMAN.

That committee refused to listen to any pleas as to the necessity from a naval point of view and refused positively to insert the item in their bill. This dredging will have twofold benefit: It will be for the benefit of commerce and for the benefit of the Navy, too. There are mercantile establishments above the Navy Yard on the Cooper River, mostly engaged in the lumber and timber industry, and vessels drawing 26 feet of water can go to them now.

There can be no reasonable objection to having this dredging provided for in the naval appropriation bill, although it benefits commerce, too. I remember in 1902 and 1903 the naval appropriation bill carried appropriations amounting to about \$750,000 for the blowing off of Hendersons Point at the entrance to the Portsmouth Navy Yard. The harbor at Portsmouth has a deep and narrow entrance and the tide rushes in and rushes out with a very swift current. The bay is like a bottle, the entrance being the neck. Before this rock was removed it was decidedly dangerous for large ships to enter. It was thought by the Navy Department that in the interest of the Navy Hendersons Point should be removed; therefore we appropriated money for it. We removed rock at Portsmouth and we now propose to remove mud at Charleston.

It has been charged by unscrupulous slanderers in newspapers that Senator Hale and Senator TILLMAN had a mutual understanding to take care of the Portsmouth and Charleston Navy Yards. A bigger falsehood was never uttered. Senator Hale was not that sort of a statesman, and I can swear that I never said a word to him about the Portsmouth Navy Yard, or the Charleston Navy Yard either, along the lines of mutual understanding. There never have been the least symptom of "you tickle me and I'll tickle you." Both navy yards can stand on their merits, and need no such support. While Portsmouth is in New Hampshire, the site of the navy yard is in Maine, and to that extent the navy yard has been cared for, as far as senatorial influence ever cares for any navy yard, by four Senators rather than two.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit just a word?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The appropriation for the removal of Hendersons Point was offered by me first, and without consultation with former Senator Hale. It was offered by me as an amendment to the river and harbor bill. It was not received favorably by the committee having that bill in charge, but they suggested that it more properly belonged to the naval appropriation bill. I then offered it to the naval appropriation bill, and it was accepted and became a part of that law; so that the Senator is absolutely right when he says that there was no collusion or suggestion of a trade between Portsmouth and Charleston in regard to this matter.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, why the appropriation of a million and eighty-five thousand dollars for the lengthening of the dry dock? The reasons are cogent and easy to give. There is nowhere in the United States a dock where a battle cruiser of such type as we propose to build can be taken care of. We have provided for four battle cruisers—the House wanted five—and it is vitally important that we should prepare docks to take care of them after they are constructed. It will take three years to build the cruisers and three or four years to construct the docks. The Charleston dock is deep enough, and wide enough, too, to accommodate battle cruisers or any other ships we have, and that dock can be lengthened sufficiently in 18 months to accommodate any battle cruiser we now contemplate building. Therefore, it seems to me a very wise and necessary step to take to have this dock so lengthened that it can accommodate battle cruisers, those we now have and those we expect to build. That is what this item is for.

It will take \$3,500,000 to build a new dry dock long enough to take a battle cruiser, while the lengthening of this old dock only requires \$1,085,000, and the \$175,000 to dredge the channel, making a total of \$1,260,000, giving us a dry dock as long as any we need have in only 18 months, accessible at all stages of the tide and capable of docking the largest ship we now have or are likely to build any time soon.

The accompanying memorandum prepared by Admiral Harris, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and one of the most accomplished engineers in the United States or anywhere else, tells all about the battle cruisers, and the docking facilities on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. I ask to have it inserted in the Record at the end of my remarks without reading, unless Senators want to have it read, so that access to it can be had. I ask to have it inserted in large type, so that it will be easier to read. The fine print in which such papers usually appear is very trying to my eyes, and I presume the eyes of many others are not much better than mine.

I trust that when my critics have read what I have said to-day they will have the decency and sense of fairness to acknowledge the error of their ways and the lack of information about the Charleston Navy Yard. And I hope those newspapers that have industriously circulated the stories about the mud at Charleston and the inability of our ships to reach the yard will print the actual facts, as I have stated them, and cease their slanderous stories about Charleston and me.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I can not allow this bill to go to passage without expressing my thanks and appreciation to the members of the Senate Naval Committee for the hearty co-operation and assistance they have given me in its preparation and passage, especially to Senators SWANSON and LODGE. We have all worked together harmoniously; and if the bill is a good one, as I believe it is, credit is due to them more, perhaps, than to myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the matter referred to by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the Record in large type.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR TILLMAN BY ADMIRAL HARRIS, CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

"MAY 15, 1916.

"It is evidently the intention to provide for the construction of several battle cruisers in the present naval act. The consensus of naval expert opinion is that the provision of such a type of vessel in our Navy is essential for naval preparedness. Battle cruisers have played an important part in such naval actions as have taken place in the present European war, notably off the South American coast in the sinking of the *Scharnhorst* and *Gneisenau* of the German squadron by the squadron under Admiral Sturdee; the action in the North Sea between the two squadrons of German and British battle cruisers, and various raids on the coast of England by German battle cruisers.

"The essential elements of this type of ship are great speed and large gun power. To secure these requirements large displacement, and especially length, are involved. The battle cruisers that will be provided for in the present naval act will be at least 850 feet in length, more than 200 feet longer than the largest

dreadnaught battleships that we have ever planned. It is apparently mandatory that we should embark at once on this type of naval construction, involving an unprecedented jump in the length of naval vessels.

"The naval dry docks that we have at the present have been designed and built for docking battleships, and when they were authorized and laid down no one even thought of the possibility of having to provide for docking vessels as long as these battle cruisers will be. As a consequence of this new development in naval architecture, there is not now a dry dock in the United States that is long enough to dock these ships when they are completed and in commission.

"We are building a dry dock at Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands which is to be 1,000 feet long, but they have had a great deal of trouble with this dock in the past, and the chances are that its construction will be a difficult and slow process, and it may not be completed and ready for use in time to receive these battle cruisers upon their completion.

"The State of Massachusetts, for its own commercial ends and also as a patriotic act, for which the State is entitled to great credit, is building a dry dock over 1,000 feet long in Boston. They expect to have it completed in 1919, but there is no assurance that it will be completed then; in fact, there is no assurance that they may not change their mind and discontinue its construction. In other words, it is a matter under the control of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and not under the Federal Government or the Navy's control.

"The Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal., has, under authority of an act of Congress, entered into a contract with the Navy Department for the use of a dry dock 1,000 feet long that they are to build in San Francisco. Under the terms of this contract the dry dock is to be completed within two years from now. However, while having the usual assurances of a contract of this character, we have no direct control of many other things which I foresee and still many more things which I do not foresee, that may happen and prevent the completion of this dry dock in that time, or even at all.

"A dry dock 1,000 feet long is being constructed and is well advanced at Balboa, Panama, Canal Zone, and will probably be ready for use in a few months from now.

"We are going to authorize the construction of at least four battle cruisers involving a cost between seventy-five and eighty million dollars, and they will probably be completed and in commission in about three years from now. In the ordinary course of events—that is, in peaceable times just for practice and cruising, a ship like that must be docked regularly—that is, once or twice a year—for scraping and painting; otherwise her bottom becomes foul and is covered with barnacles and marine growth and she becomes heavy and difficult to propel through the water and loses her speed, the most essential requirement of a battle cruiser. Or even worse, if the ship runs aground or gets into a collision she must be taken into a dry dock to be repaired. But principally we are going to build these battle cruisers to have them ready for use in case we should get into difficulties with some other nation, and to use them in that way means to use them in battle, and we must expect to have some of them injured under water by gunfire or by torpedoes, just as has happened with the British battle cruiser *Tiger* in the North Sea action, and when so injured they are, of course, useless until they can be taken into some dry dock and be repaired, so that if you do not make provision for the dry docks for these ships it is useless to build them. In fact, if you build them without providing dry docks for them you might lose one or more of them through collision or battle damage, where otherwise you could have saved them and made them ready again for service if you had had foresight enough to provide dry docks convenient and close to where the accident or damage occurred.

"Now, a new dry dock of the large size required would cost about \$4,000,000, and this is a great deal of money; but, even so, it is only a fractional part of the cost of a single battle cruiser. It takes as long, or longer, under the most favorable conditions to build a dry dock than it will take to build one of these battle cruisers.

"We are going to build these battle cruisers; we have not a naval dry dock completed that will dock them. By the time they are completed we will undoubtedly have the Panama dry dock ready for them. We may have the dry dock at Pearl Harbor ready for them, but that is not certain. If things go well and the State of Massachusetts and the Union Iron Works do not change their minds about it, we may have the Boston State dry dock and the Union Iron Works dock at San Francisco ready for them. If the present naval act provides for a new dry dock at Norfolk and at Philadelphia, we will surely have those docks ready some day; but, considering our past expe-

rience on dry-dock construction, I am not far off in predicting that they will not be ready in time to dock these battle cruisers.

"Just picture the situation that we may be in with four of these magnificent, costly vessels, and the only place that we can take them for docking and repair will be the dry dock at Panama, or, even if things go well at Pearl Harbor, they will only then have the choice of being docked in Panama or in the middle of the Pacific—the Hawaiian Islands. That means that whether we like it or not and even if it does not fit in with our plans of strategy our squadron of battle cruisers will have to be kept in the Pacific Ocean or on the Caribbean Sea, or at least will have to go there twice a year to be looked after for repairs. In case we should need them for the ultimate purpose for which they are built—to use against an enemy—with the possibility of being damaged and requiring immediate repairs to save them from sinking, we would have to select an obliging enemy, who would be willing to fix the scene of naval combat in the vicinity of either the Panama Canal or the Pearl Harbor dry dock; and, of course, our friendly enemy would be as familiar with our predicament as we are, and would undoubtedly be disobliging enough to insist on fighting at some place other than would suit our convenience.

"If the dry dock that is to be built by the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal., were completed we would be somewhat better off in the Pacific zone, and if the dry dock being built by the State of Massachusetts in Boston is completed, this would help us a lot in the North Atlantic, so that we would probably have the choice of taking these battle cruisers for docking either to Boston or to Panama, and these two places are over 2,500 miles apart, so that if you had a badly damaged battle cruiser between these points it would be quite a trip for her, in her injured condition, to reach either dock, with a good chance that she would sink before you could get her into one of these ports.

"The Secretary of the Navy recognized this condition, as shown by his statement before the House Naval Committee, on pages 3592, 3593, and 3594 of the published statement of his hearings, in which he urges the construction of a 1,000-foot dry dock at Norfolk, and also suggests that it is desirable to lengthen the Puget Sound dock, and construct 1,000-foot docks at New York and Philadelphia. He shows in his statement that we are hardly warranted in embarking on the construction of battle cruisers unless the dry docks for their docking and repair are also immediately provided for. But he also states, as I have just told you, that it takes longer to build a dry dock than it does to build a battle cruiser, so that any belated action that we might take in making appropriations for the construction of the dry docks that he recommends, namely, at Norfolk and Philadelphia, will not insure that these docks will be completed when the battle cruisers are completed. They probably will not be ready for these battle cruisers until they have been in commission and sailing at sea for a year or so.

"But even with the completion of the Norfolk dock, I want to invite your attention to the fact that the distance from Norfolk to Panama is nearly 2,100 miles, so that if we should have a fleet action take place between Norfolk and Panama the injured ships would have to take quite a long trip to get to either dock, and everyone familiar with the sea knows of the risks of taking an injured ship around Cape Hatteras, and that if we had a dry dock on the Atlantic coast south of Cape Hatteras they would not take the chance of trying to take her around the cape, and such a dry dock under these conditions would very likely mean the saving of one or two of such ships from sinking.

"Of course one dry dock will afford all the necessary docking facilities for a great many ships for ordinary painting and repairing, although in the case of an injury, such, for instance, as happened to the *Arkansas* when she ran aground, that ship may be in the dry dock and prevent its use for other ships for several months. But even so, two, or at the most three, of the big dry docks at one place would supply all of the docking facilities that we would need if we could keep our ships in the general vicinity of this place; but we can not do that. We have a long coast line. The theater of our future naval actions may be in the Pacific, any place in the Atlantic, in the Caribbean Sea, or in the Gulf, and we must provide docks and dockyards with that end in view.

"We have a dry dock in the Charleston Harbor at the navy yard, and it is wide and deep enough to receive battle cruisers or battleships of the larger size; but it is not long enough; its length is such that it can not take ships over 545 feet long. It is possible to extend this dry dock to such a length that it will take ships 900 feet long, and the natural conditions down there are such that this could be done very economically and expeditiously. The Bureau of Yards and Docks estimates the cost of this lengthening at \$1,085,000, and states that the construction involves no momentous problems, as the entire site is underlain by a stratum of marl of great thickness. This dock could be

lengthened so that it could dock battle cruisers and the whole project carried out and completed within a year and one-half; at least that is what the chief of that bureau tells me, and the work could be so performed that the dock would not be out of use for docking during the entire lengthening period except for about three months, when connection would be made between the extension and the old dock. This process of lengthening was followed out at Norfolk a few years ago, and that dock was in use during the entire period of lengthening except for three months.

"It is desirable now to build dry docks of the same length and width as the locks of the Panama Canal; that is, 110 feet wide by 1,000 feet long. It is not practical to extend the dry dock at Charleston to a length of 1,000 feet, because there is a large and handsome power house in the way, and it would be necessary to destroy this building in order to make the dock 1,000 feet long, and that, of course, is not advisable. However, it could be built 925 feet long, so that it would take a 900-foot ship, which is a greater length than, I am informed, will be required for these battle cruisers. The cost of a new dry dock 1,000 feet long at Charleston, or any other place, would be nearly \$4,000,000, and it would undoubtedly require at least four years to build it. But we have an opportunity at Charleston now to lengthen the present dock so that it will answer the purpose of docking battle cruisers at a cost of about a quarter of the cost of a new dock and be ready in a year and one-half, or long before the battle cruisers will be launched and in commission. This is the only yard that we can do this at, as the naval dry docks on the Atlantic coast at Boston and Philadelphia are too narrow and shallow. The large dry dock at New York can not be lengthened; they have not the space; and the dry dock at Norfolk has already been lengthened as much as it is practicable to lengthen it.

"If we are going to build these battle cruisers—and I take it we are, and I, for one, am in favor of building them—we should have a dry dock on the Atlantic coast south of Hatteras capable of docking them; and above all things, we should have a dry dock on the Atlantic coast ready to receive them when they are launched, and the only way of surely securing such a dry dock for them is to lengthen the dry dock at Charleston, because the conditions down there are such that this can be done before these ships are afloat; and besides, it will only involve an expenditure considerably less than one-third of the cost of a new dry dock."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the final passage of the bill, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement about the transfer of my pair that I made on the last vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as heretofore in regard to my pair and its transfer, and vote "yea." I take this occasion to announce that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] has requested me to say that if he had been present he would have voted in accordance with the recommendations of the committee, and that he is in favor of the passage of this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I voted for the House program as against the Senate program, and think that should have prevailed. But recognizing the fact that this is one of the great supply bills, and that the majority must control, and that the bill must be passed—

Mr. GALLINGER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that debate is out of order. Nothing is in order but the calling of the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is one of the unfortunate rules of the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (continuing). I vote "yea." If the Senator had waited a moment he would have heard my vote.

Mr. PENROSE. It would not have made any difference.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement heretofore made, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED. Making the same announcement that I made on the last roll call as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—71.

Ashurst	Harding	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hollis	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Husting	Owen	Smoot
Brady	James	Page	Sterling
Brandeggee	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	Stone
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Swanson
Bryan	Jones	Pittman	Taggart
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Polindexter	Thompson
Chilton	Kern	Pomerene	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Ransdell	Townsend
Colt	Lee, Md.	Reed	Underwood
Culberson	Lewis	Robinson	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lodge	Shafroth	Walsh
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Warren
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Weeks
Fletcher	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—8.

Clapp	Gronna	Norris	Vardaman
Curtis	La Follette	Thomas	Works

NOT VOTING—16.

Cañon	Gore	Lippitt	Saulsbury
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	McCumber	Sherman
Fall	Hughes	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Goff	Lea, Tenn.	O'Gorman	Sutherland

So the bill was passed.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask leave to report back favorably from the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 17053) making additional appropriations for the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1917, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. I will explain to the Senate that it is an emergency appropriation for the relief of the infantile paralysis epidemic and some epidemics of typhoid fever. The bill has passed the House and it is estimated for as an emergency appropriation, and I ask that it be considered by unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following additional sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1917, namely:

For additional assistant surgeons, \$50,000.

Interstate Quarantine Service: For cooperation with State and municipal health authorities in the prevention of the spread of contagious and infectious diseases in interstate traffic, \$85,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 16460, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 16460) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to address myself to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and call his attention to a notice given by him on July 14, 1916, and appearing on the calendar of business, that following the passage of the naval appropriation bill he would move the consideration of the immigration bill. Perhaps the Senator has forgotten that notice, and I wanted to call his attention to it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No, Mr. President. The fact had been brought to my attention that the Army appropriation bill was to be taken up; but the real facts in the case are that there seemed to be some understanding—certainly on this side—to the effect that these bills should first be passed.

Mr. PENROSE. Which bills?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The appropriation bills.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I did not yield for the purpose—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. For that reason I have not called it up. I do not want the Senator to understand that I am derelict in my duty about the immigration bill. This Senate will have a chance to vote on it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator to raise a discussion with reference to the immigration bill. The Army bill is before the Senate, and I shall insist upon its consideration.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask leave to make three reports from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator having the bill in charge whether there is going to be an adjournment this evening and we are to have a morning hour to-morrow, or whether the Senate is to take a recess?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. At the request of quite a number of Senators—and I think there is a sort of an understanding to that effect—I am going to ask, at the proper time, that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow morning.

Mr. SMOOT. Then it seems to me that the Senators having morning business ought to leave it until the morning hour, and let us proceed now with the Army bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be taken up for the purpose of considering the Senate committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for committee amendments, the amendments of the committee to be first considered. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, just a moment. If that is to be taken as unanimous consent, I want to object to it. If it is simply a motion, I am willing that it should pass pro forma, as the motions pass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the only way it can be done.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was putting it in the usual form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can not be done by a motion. It requires unanimous consent to dispense with the formal reading of the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no purpose in it except to save time. I assumed that Senators had read the House bill.

Mr. CLAPP. I will be very frank with the Senator. It is desired to make a motion and give a notice before this bill is adopted. If the reading of the amendments is likely to take 10 or 15 minutes, I will make no objection to the Senator's request for unanimous consent.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It will take that long.

Mr. CLAPP. Very well. I withdraw the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the request of the Senator from Oregon is granted. The Secretary will read the bill for committee amendments.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, before the reading of the bill is proceeded with, I desire to make a very brief statement in reference to the subject matter thereof.

The bill as it was reported to the House of Representatives appropriated \$157,223,246.10. There was added during its consideration by the House of Representatives \$30,365,800, and there was deducted \$5,285,690, leaving a net increase of \$25,080,110. As it finally passed the House it carried an appropriation of \$182,303,356.10. The increases recommended by the Senate—and I call the attention of Senators to the report that came from the committee with the bill—amounted to \$154,053,794, and the decreases recommended by the committee amounted to \$5,758,140, leaving a net increase recommended by the Senate committee of \$148,295,654. So that the total of the bill as reported to the Senate is \$330,599,010.10.

Mr. President, that seems like a very large increase, and, as a matter of fact, it is; but the conditions under which the bill was reported to the House not only changed materially from time to time in the course of the consideration of it by the House committee and in the course of its consideration by the House and its passage, but they had changed very materially at the time it was taken up for consideration by the Senate committee. When the House began consideration of the bill on the 20th day of March there had been no law enacted for the reorganization of the Army. There had been no consideration given to the federalization of the National Guard.

When the bill finally passed the House of Representatives on June 26, 1916, the Army reorganization bill had just passed Congress, but the House of Representatives did not have reliable

and full estimates based upon that reorganization, nor upon the expenses of the National Guard, nor practically any of the matters that had been included and required by the terms of the reorganization act of June 3, 1916. So while the Senate increases to this bill seem exorbitant, and without explanation serious, Senators can very readily see that the increases are due to the fact that the Army had been reorganized just before the House bill passed, the National Guard had been federalized, and immediately thereafter the Regulars and the National Guard were mobilized for use on the border. So the necessities of the situation compelled the Senate committee to meet the conditions as they actually existed and without any regard to the mere possibilities of the future.

Mr. President, I desire to say here that there seems to be a very serious misapprehension upon the part of some of our friends, in and out of Congress, in claiming that the committees of Congress and Members of Congress have been chasing a sort of a shadow, that they have been frightened into taking steps looking to preparedness without any foundation for it, and really apprehending a danger which did not exist. Let me say to you, Mr. President, that that has not been the fact with reference to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. I do not think I have the reputation of being easily frightened, unless it be that I am timid about making a speech to the Senate.

I can assure the Senate in all that I have done, both with respect to the reorganization of the Army and with respect to this appropriation, has been done coolly and deliberately and with a view single to the best interests of the country, and I am satisfied that the Military Affairs Committee who are men of sound and discriminating judgment have acted in the same way and upon the same theory. As an evidence of that, we have three gentlemen on that committee who went through the Civil War on the side of the Union forces and one who served as a soldier of the Confederacy. I have never at any time seen either or any of these gentlemen, or in fact, any of the members of the committee frightened into hasty action with reference to a proper reorganization of the Army or of making appropriations necessary to support that Army when reorganized.

I deny the charge, Mr. President, which has been suggested here from time to time, and sometimes in other places that Members of Congress who favor preparation for national defense have acted in ignorance of the situation in this country, or that Members thereof have been acting as the subservient tools of munition factories in order to impose taxation upon the people.

Mr. President, it would seem that the only wise and honest people in America are the men who have opposed any program of preparation for national defense. I do not question the motives of the gentlemen who pretend to this claim. I credit them with having acted in perfect good faith in opposing anything that looked either to the reorganization of the Army or the increase of the Navy or in providing increased appropriations for the Army itself.

I have never at any time made any charges against these gentlemen, and I deny the suggestion that we have been befogged or "jobbed," as one Senator has expressed it, by those interested in the sale of munitions of war and other implements of destruction.

Mr. President, there have been eminent gentlemen in all the history of our country who have been opposed to the maintenance of an Army or Navy or anything looking toward better preparation for national defense. In Revolutionary days there were distinguished gentlemen who opposed anything like preparation for defense against the British. There have been men during the whole life of this Republic who before every war have opposed anything looking to placing our country in a position where it could defend itself. These gentlemen in Revolutionary days were called Tories, and if their wishes had been acceded to, America would to-day be a colony of the British Crown.

These same gentlemen in the Continental Congress opposed the appropriation of money to properly raise, equip, and outfit an army for the purposes of defence. Washington realized it, but it took the Continental Congress three or four years to understand that unless something were done to assist the Colonial troops and the militia of the country in the fight they were making against Great Britain, defeat must inevitably be the result of our war with the mother country. Finally, with all this opposition by distinguished pacifists of that day, Mr. President, Congress finally concluded that unless the control of the forces and the handling of the armies in this country were placed in the hands of one man there was no question as to

what would be the result of that controversy. As has been said here to-day by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and in substance the other day by another distinguished Senator, but for the fact that Great Britain had other things to look after about the time she had that war and the war of 1812 with us, we would have been defeated anyhow.

Every one knows, Mr. President, that but for the sudden and auspicious appearance of the French off Chesapeake Bay in the last days of the Revolution Washington's army, exhausted as it was, would have been overcome by the enemy.

Mr. President, the same condition of things existed in 1812. There were distinguished gentlemen then as now who opposed anything like a preparation for the national defense. The same arguments were made then as now. The ghost of militarism frightened them then as now. I am not criticising the attitude of the gentlemen who are opposed to placing our country in a proper position of defending itself against any foe, whether within or without. They have a right to their opinion. I am simply calling attention to the facts of history.

Similar conditions existed in 1845. If Senators will take the trouble to look over the records preceding the Congresses when these wars came upon us they will find the same arguments against preparedness were made then as now. The speeches of John Randolph and others in 1800 and 1811 were along the same line, opposing anything like the maintenance of an army in this country because it endangered the country and its institutions and was likely to cultivate a spirit of militarism.

So in 1861. The same conditions existed then and the same kind of speeches were made in opposition to taking steps to maintain an army that would enable the United States to preserve the Union and to protect itself. The distinguished gentlemen at that time who opposed the maintenance of an army were called copperheads, and their opposition to the prosecution of the war was pretty effective. There are copperheads to-day, Mr. President, who are placing every obstacle in the way of our distinguished President, whether his policies be for peace or for preparation for emergencies of war.

If the men who advocated preparedness prior to 1861 had been listened to, there would have been no defeat like that at the first Battle of Bull Run, when the Union Army fled in disgrace and in utter rout. The Civil War, which was prolonged for four or five long years, with the sacrifice of millions of treasure and thousands of lives, would have been ended in six months. I think that is the consensus of opinion amongst men who understood the situation in those days.

Now, I have no criticism to make of my friends who differ from me about this matter, Mr. President. There is not a man in the Senate for whom I have a higher regard than the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], but I want to resent just as strongly as I can his suggestion that those who favor preparedness are either knaves or fools. And yet I had rather be placed in the category of a knave and be prepared when an emergency comes and our country is assailed than to be placed in the category of a fool and have our country overpowered by the first strong military power that sees fit to attack us because we are not prepared to defend ourselves.

I had rather, Mr. President, have imposed upon the people of this country a tax that they can not pay in a generation and preserve our institutions and our liberty than to remain in a condition where we must be the prey of any first-class military power that sees fit to attack us.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does not the Senator from Oregon think that the expense entailed by adequate naval and army preparation would be a mere drop in the bucket as compared with the thousands of millions that would be lost in the panic that would ensue in this country in case we should get into a difficulty and be attacked when we were unprepared for it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think there is any question about that. If we can believe the newspapers, it is now costing Great Britain \$30,000,000 a day and thousands of lives of the flower of its youth.

I do not believe in a large standing army any more than do my friends who are against any preparation. I have always opposed a large standing army. I do believe, however, in a strong Navy, and I have to-day voted for increasing our Navy because it is the first line of defense. But we have no large standing army. We have about 130,000 National Guardsmen mustered into the service now, and a little over 100,000 Regulars. That is about all we have, and that is a small army for a population of 100,000,000 people, with, as the President says,

the countries of Europe in a state of conflagration and our southern border threatened with invasion by a hostile people.

Now, I do not think there is going to be any war, but, Mr. President, we do not know whether there will be or not, and preparation for an event that might come is simply taking out an insurance policy, that is all, for protection against the future.

It costs something, but this Government is worth spending a good deal of money for, and its institutions are worth more to the democracies of the world than it is possible to spend. I do not know whether we are going to have any war or not, but I do hope we may be prepared for one if one does come.

I disagree from some of the Senators who claim that because Europe will be exhausted when the war is over, and that therefore we are safe from attack in that quarter.

Mr. President, there is an active, virile nation across the Pacific from us that at some time or another—it may not be in my day and generation, I hope it may never be—we may have to meet; and we will have to meet it some time unless America does what Count Okuma said she must do, and that is to get off her pedestal of superiority as a race and place herself on an equality with the oriental races. He is not the only great Japanese statesman who has said that must be done. It is a proud race, it is a strong race, it is a virile race, and if I may be permitted to say so, it is a predatory race, and predatory nations in this day and generation, Mr. President, do not travel singly; they travel in flocks, and there are other predatory nations on the Continent of Europe that seem to be joining hands with her. Japan has a treaty now with Russia. I do not know what the terms of it are, nor do I care. I do not care what sort of a treaty they or any nations enter into, but it behooves the United States to be ready to meet any single nation or any combination of nations.

It was very truly said by a distinguished German statesman a short while ago that a treaty is simply a piece of parchment or paper to be destroyed whenever the interests of nations require that such treaty should be not observed.

Mr. President, treaties between the United States and Great Britain are being violated to-day by Great Britain, and the British, it is claimed, are the best friends that America has. The treaties between other nations have been and are now being violated and disregarded whenever it suits the interests of the powers to disregard them.

Japan and England have had a treaty, offensive and defensive. I believe the United States was exempted from its provisions in part; but that exemption will not protect the United States whenever it suits the interests of Great Britain and Japan to join hands against our country. I am not insinuating that any such conjunction will ever take place or any joint attack ever be made by these nations or any nations against the United States, but I am calling attention to conditions that actually exist; and I insist, and have insisted for two years or more, living on the western coast as I do, that the United States ought to be prepared to defend herself, if need be, against those or any powers, acting in concert or otherwise.

Japan is not satisfied with that treaty. Why? Because, amongst other things, Great Britain treats the Japanese worse than it is alleged the people of the United States do, not only on the Pacific coast but in Australia as well. The Japanese people in Victoria and Vancouver and in other places are discriminated against, notwithstanding the treaty of alliance between them. Japan is just as angry at the treatment of her subjects there as she is at the treatment of her subjects in the United States, and justly so.

The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] touched the keynote of the situation the other day when he rather insisted that the United States has the undoubted right to do as she pleases with reference to these great racial questions and her internal policies. The United States is never going to be satisfied to treat any oriental nation so as to bring them within the usual favored-nation clause of treaties. They will not do it; they will never consent to do it.

I have no prejudice against the Japanese. I am just stating the conditions as they actually exist. Japan says that the United States must treat her subjects exactly as they treat the subjects of any other country. Right here on the floor of the Senate I protested against the treaty between the United States and Japan because we pretended to put them in the category of other nations, and then had a gentleman's agreement on the side that they were not to be so treated. In other words, we transferred to them the right to visé the passports of her emigrants who came within the prohibited class instead of exercising our undoubted right to exercise that high prerogative ourselves. Only two or three of us voted against that treaty. I was

taking the position then that my distinguished friend from California took the other day, that we have a right to do as we please with our country and assert our rights against the world.

Let me refer a moment again to Japan. Japan it is reported is going to abrogate her treaty with England. It is said she made a treaty with Russia. I do not know what that means, but they are two of the most powerful military nations on the face of the earth. The Japanese are the powder bearers, the dynamite carriers, and the railroad builders of the Pacific coast; and, according to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], who made a speech here some months ago, they have more trained veterans on the Pacific coast than we have in the Regular Army of continental United States. We look complacently on these things, Mr. President, and say that the same Providence that has looked over our country in the past is likely to continue to do so in the future.

I hope he may; I believe he will; but while this terrible condition of war exists on the face of the earth we at least ought to be ready to defend ourselves against any power that may threaten us.

Mr. President, we have only a few trained aviators in this country; Japan has, I am informed, 400. Her volunteer soldiers go out and march 15 or 20 miles every day, practically without pay; they dig trenches and cut barbed-wire entanglements merely for the sake of learning how such things are done. Yet I still hope that we shall not have any trouble with Japan. I am simply suggesting that these appropriations ought to be made for the purpose of preparing in part in case we have trouble with any other power of the earth.

We have now something like 135,000 National Guardsmen mustered into the Federal service and we have something over 100,000 Regulars. This appropriation bill is increased largely because provision was not made for the National Guard in the other House either for their pay, for their transportation, or their subsistence. We have increased the bill to meet those emergencies and conditions on the frontier. As these items come up I shall be very glad to explain them to the Senate.

I am frank to say that when the bill was made up we inserted some items, in view of the then existing situation in Mexico, which might now justly be cut out, and I shall at the proper time ask the Senate to reduce them. I think they will amount to twenty-five or thirty million dollars. I have not estimated exactly the amount, but the bill will be reduced quite largely to meet conditions as they are, and not contemplated conditions which were likely to have occurred if we had intervened in Mexico. The bill, as reported by the Senate committee, undertook to make provision for those things. That is one reason why the bill seems so large.

Mr. President, with this brief statement of the conditions and of some of the ideas which animated our committee in the preparation of the bill, I desire to say that I hope we may speed the bill along as fast as we can and get it through at as early a day as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 1, after line 6, to strike out:

Contingencies of the Army: For all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the office of the Chief of Staff; for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, exclusive of personal services in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., arising at home or abroad, but impossible to be anticipated or classified; to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, including the payment of a per diem allowance not to exceed \$4 in lieu of subsistence to employees of the War Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts, \$25,000.

And insert:

Contingencies of the Army: For all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the office of the Chief of Staff; for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including personal services in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified; to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, including the payment of a per diem allowance not to exceed \$4 in lieu of subsistence to employees of the War Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Chief of Staff," on page 5, line 2, after "\$35,350," to insert:

Provided, That officers in the grade of second lieutenant in the Field Artillery may be assigned, for the period of one year, to batteries stationed at the School of Fire for Field Artillery at Fort Sill, Okla., for the purpose of pursuing courses of practical instruction in field artillery.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Chief Signal Officer," on page 7, line 16, after the word "ranges" to insert "motorcycles and motor-driven vehicles used for technical and official purposes; professional and scientific books of reference, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, and maps, for use in the office of the Chief Signal Officer," so as to read:

Signal Service of the Army: For expenses of the Signal Service of the Army, as follows: Purchase, equipment, and repair of field electric telegraphs, radio installations, signal equipments and stores, binocular glasses, telescopes, heliostats, and other necessary instruments, including necessary meteorological instruments for use on target ranges; motorcycles and motor-driven vehicles used for technical and official purposes; professional and scientific books of reference, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, and maps, for use in the office of the Chief Signal Officer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 4, after the word "otherwise," to strike out "\$3,755,000" and insert "\$14,827,156," so as to make the clause read:

Signal Service of the Army: For expenses of the Signal Service of the Army, as follows: Purchase, equipment, and repair of field electric telegraphs, radio installations, signal equipment and stores, binocular glasses, telescopes, heliostats, and other necessary instruments, including necessary meteorological instruments for use on target ranges; motorcycles and motor-driven vehicles used for technical and official purposes; professional and scientific books of reference, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, and maps, for use in the office of the Chief Signal Officer; war balloons and airships and accessories, including their maintenance and repair; telephone apparatus (exclusive of exchange service) and maintenance of the same; electrical installations and maintenance at military posts; fire-control and direction apparatus and material for field artillery; maintenance and repair of military lines and cables, including salaries of civilian employees, supplies, general repairs, reserved supplies, and other expenses connected with the duty of collecting and transmitting information for the Army by telegraph or otherwise, \$14,827,156.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is a great increase, amounting to \$10,000,000, and I think the amendment had better be passed over in order that we may have some explanation of it. I also ask that the next amendment be passed over. I am not opposed to them, but I think an increase of from \$3,000,000 to \$14,000,000 ought to have some discussion.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I also ask that it be passed over.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 8, line 6, after the word "than," to strike out "\$3,222,100" and insert "\$13,281,666," so as to read:

Provided, however, That not more than \$13,281,666 of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the purchase, manufacture, maintenance, operation, and repair of airships and other aerial machines and accessories necessary in the aviation section; and for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles which may be necessary for the aviation section: Provided further, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the above sum will be available for the payment of all expenses in connection with the development of a suitable type of aviation motor, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That depends on the other amendment, and will go over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 9, after line 10, to strike out:

Purchase of land in the State of California for aviation school purposes: For the acquisition, by purchase or by condemnation, of a site or sites in the State of California for an aviation school and training grounds of the Signal Corps of the United States Army, not to exceed \$800,000.

And insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept for the United States from any citizen of the United States a donation of a tract or tracts of land suitable and desirable in his judgment for the purposes of an aviation field and remount station, the terms of the donation also to authorize the use of the property donated for any other service of the United States which may hereafter appear desirable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Pay of officers of the line," on page 10, line 14, after the word "line," to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert:

\$11,400,000: Provided, That in applying section 25 of the national defense act approved June 3, 1916, the President shall assign to officers of the Army such constructive dates of original commission, from which lengths of commissioned service shall be computed, as will preserve their rights to promotion in accordance with their relative order on the lineal lists of their arms and continue in effect losses of files occasioned by sentences of courts-martial or failures to pass required examinations for promotion, said constructive dates of original commission to be subject to change whenever a change thereof may be necessary in order to carry into effect losses of files hereafter incurred by any officer through a sentence of court-martial or a failure to pass a required ex-

amination for promotion: Provided further, That in determining the arm from which a detail is to be made to a vacancy in the detached officers' list, as provided in the third proviso of section 25 of the national defense act approved June 3, 1916, the officer of any grade who is the senior in that grade according to the constructive dates of original commission provided for in the preceding proviso shall be considered the senior in length of commissioned service of all officers of that grade: And provided further, That when by reason of increase in the arm, corps, or branch of the service in which an officer is commissioned his loss of files in lineal rank due to suspension from promotion on account of failure to pass the required examination therefor exceeds the loss he would have sustained if no such increase had occurred, he shall, if promoted upon reexamination, be advanced to the position he would have occupied in the grade to which promoted had no increase occurred.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will ask the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the committee, what is the purpose of that amendment and the necessity for the increase in the expenditure?

Mr. WARREN. It is to correct an error in section 25 of the military reorganization law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I presume the Senator refers to the affirmative legislation. The affirmative legislation is designed to equalize promotions so as to preserve the relative rank of the officers under their commissions. That is all it does. It is introduced in this bill at the request of the War Department to preserve intact the relative rank of the officers under their commissions. As to the appropriation, if the Senator would like to have the estimate for the increase I will give it to him. It is for the first increment provided for under the military reorganization or national defense act. The House provision was made without regard to that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 11, line 21, after the word "service," to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000," so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay to officers for length of service, \$2,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 22, to insert:

For pay of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to temporary duty, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 12, to insert:

For pay of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to duty with troops or at field exercises, or for instruction, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 3, to insert:

For pay of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps appointed temporary second lieutenants at \$100 per month, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 7, after the words "National Guard," to strike out "\$2,225,000" and insert "\$11,400,000," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of officers, National Guard, \$11,400,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, is that amount necessary because of the increase in the National Guard, or is it because of an anticipated increase?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will insert in the RECORD the estimate furnished by the department.

Mr. OVERMAN. All I want to know is whether the amount is made necessary to pay the National Guard who have been called into the service?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is for the National Guard already under arms. It is to pay them. The House bill did not provide for them except on a peace basis.

Mr. OVERMAN. They were called out after the House bill was passed?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They were called out after the House bill was practically completed. The Senator will observe that many of these increases are due to the fact that the National Guard was not provided for in the House bill. They had not been called out, as a matter of fact, and now there are one hundred and thirty odd thousand of them under arms.

Mr. WARREN. And they receive the same pay as the Regular soldiers?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They receive the same pay as the Regulars, and if they had gone over the line they would have had 20 per cent more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Pay of enlisted men," on page 12, line 10, after "\$23,000,000," to insert:

Provided, That hereafter one of the enlisted men detached from the Army at large for duty at each of the recruit depots under the provisions of the act of June 12, 1906, shall, while so detached, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a regimental sergeant major.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to reserve the right to offer an amendment to that item a little later on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator refer to the one just read?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. To the amendment just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator desires to offer an amendment to the amendment it had better go over.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Very well. I make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 12, after line 16, to insert:

For pay of enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserves, at \$24 per year, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 18, to insert:

For pay of enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserves while engaged in field training for a period not exceeding 15 days each year, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 21, to insert:

For bounty at the rate of \$3 per month to enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserves mobilized by order of the President, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 24, to insert:

For bounty for reenlistments in time of war, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

For pay of members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps when called into actual service, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 2, to insert:

For pay of members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps when called out for instruction or training for periods not exceeding 15 days in any one calendar year, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 6, after the words

"National Guard," to strike out "\$7,750,000" and insert "\$23,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of enlisted men of all grades, National Guard, \$23,000,000: *Provided*, That all officers and enlisted men of the National Guard who are Government employees and who respond to the call of the President for service shall, at the expiration of the military service to which they are called, be restored to the positions occupied by them at the time of the call.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I ask that that amendment go over. That is an amendment affecting the pay of the National Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers," on page 13, line 14, after the word "men," to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$787,500," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of enlisted men, \$787,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department," on page 13, line 17, after the word "men," to strike out "\$275,000" and insert "\$351,000," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of enlisted men, \$351,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 18, after the word "service," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps," on page 13, line 20, after the word "men," to strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$2,150,000," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of enlisted men, \$2,150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps," on page 13, line 23, after the word "men," to strike out "\$551,664" and insert "\$890,000," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of enlisted men, \$890,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department," on page 14, line 2, after the word "men," to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,743,300," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of enlisted men, \$1,743,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 3, to insert:

For pay of privates, first class, when rated as dispensary assistants, nurses, or surgical assistants, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 5, to strike out:

Pay to clerks, messengers, and laborers at headquarters of the several Territorial departments, Territorial districts, tactical divisions and brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff.

One chief clerk, at the office of the Chief of Staff, \$2,250 per annum.

Three clerks, at \$2,000 each per annum.

Twelve clerks, at \$1,800 each per annum.

Fifteen clerks, at \$1,600 each per annum.

Thirty-eight clerks, at \$1,400 each per annum.

Seventy clerks, at \$1,200 each per annum.

Sixty-five clerks, at \$1,000 each per annum.

Six clerks (Filipinos), at \$500 each per annum.

One captain of the watch, at \$900 per annum.

Three watchmen, at \$720 each per annum.

One gardener, at \$720 per annum.

One packer, at \$840 per annum.

Two messengers, at \$840 each per annum.

Fifty-nine messengers, at \$720 each per annum.

Six messengers (Filipinos), at \$300 each per annum.

One laborer, at \$660 per annum.

Two laborers, at \$600 each per annum.

Five charwomen, at \$240 each per annum.

In all, \$312,690.

Additional pay while on foreign service, \$9,000.

And insert:

CLERKS, MESSENGERS, AND LABORERS, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

One chief clerk, at \$2,250 per annum, \$2,250;

Four clerks, at \$2,000 each per annum, \$8,000;

Six clerks, at \$1,800 each per annum, \$10,800;

Eleven clerks, at \$1,600 each per annum, \$17,600;

Fifteen clerks, at \$1,400 each per annum, \$21,000;

Twenty-one clerks, at \$1,200 each per annum, \$25,200;

Thirteen clerks, at \$1,000 each per annum, \$13,000;

One captain of the watch, at \$900 per annum, \$900;

Three watchmen, at \$720 each per annum, \$2,160;

One gardener, at \$720 per annum, \$720;

One packer, at \$840 per annum, \$840;

One chief messenger, at \$1,000 per annum, \$1,000;

One messenger, at \$840 per annum, \$840;

Twenty messengers, at \$720 each per annum, \$14,400;

One laborer, at \$660 per annum, \$660;

Two laborers, at \$600 each per annum, \$1,200;

Five charwomen, at \$240 each per annum, \$1,200;

In all, \$121,770.

CLERKS AND MESSENGERS FOR HEADQUARTERS OF THE SEVERAL TERRITORIAL DEPARTMENTS, DISTRICTS, DIVISIONS AND BRIGADES, AND SERVICE SCHOOLS.

Seven clerks, at \$2,000 each per annum, \$14,000;

Eleven clerks, at \$1,800 each per annum, \$19,800;

Fourteen clerks, at \$1,600 each per annum, \$22,400;

Thirty-two clerks, at \$1,400 each per annum, \$44,800;

Fifty-seven clerks, at \$1,200 each per annum, \$68,400;

Forty-nine clerks, at \$1,000 each per annum, \$49,000;

Thirty-nine messengers, at \$720 each per annum, \$28,080;

In all, \$246,480.

Additional pay while on foreign service, \$9,000.

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, \$19,650.

Hereafter headquarters clerks shall be known as Army field clerks and shall receive pay at the rates herein provided, and after 12 years of service, at least 3 years of which shall have been on detached duty away from permanent station, or on duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, or both, shall receive the same allowances, except retirement, as heretofore allowed by law to pay clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and shall be subject to the rules and articles of war.

Hereafter not to exceed 200 clerks, Quartermaster Corps, who shall have had 12 years of service, at least 3 years of which shall have been on detached duty away from permanent station, or on duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, or both, shall be known as field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and shall receive the same allowances, except retirement, as heretofore allowed by law to pay clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and shall be subject to the rules and articles of war.

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, \$151,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire why it is necessary to provide for so many messengers? Thirty-nine messengers are provided for in one item. It is stated that they are "for headquarters of the several territorial departments." How many territorial departments are there?

Mr. WARREN. Wherever there are troops, clerical assistance and messengers are required and have to be sent. This item represents the help that is required all over the country at various points where there are troops, whether it is a continental division, including a third of the United States, or whether it is a point where there is but a regiment of troops.

Mr. OVERMAN. How many messengers do they have in a camp?

Mr. WARREN. I do not know that I can tell the Senator how many they put in a camp. I think there would be only one in an ordinary camp, but in a large headquarters there will,

of course, be more. I will say to the Senator that we put in less than was estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "The Adjutant General's Department," on page 17, line 20, after the words "The Adjutant General's Department," to strike out "\$80,500" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers of The Adjutant General's Department, \$100,000.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if the Senate committee made proper and sufficient allowance, in connection with The Adjutant General's office, for an expansion of the work there?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that as to clerks, this bill does not touch The Adjutant General's office at all as far as Washington is concerned, but provides for the clerks in the territory outside of Washington. The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill carries the clerks for The Adjutant General's office here, and I may say to the Senator that there are estimates already made for the deficiency bill for an increase of clerical force here in Washington on account of the increase in troops.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It is perfectly obvious that some increase should be granted there.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will look on page 29 of the bill he will find a provision for additional clerks in the field on account of the muster into the service of the United States of the National Guard.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to ask whether all the clerks provided for here on page 15 are for field service? Are they all clerks outside of Washington?

Mr. WARREN. The clerks for the General Staff are in Washington. That is, when I say they are in Washington, the large proportion of them are here, but some are sent out whenever officers of the General Staff are sent away on duty.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is on the Committee on Appropriations, and he knows that we provided for all the clerks here in Washington in the legislative bill.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; you provided for all of them, except that we have heretofore provided for the clerks for the General Staff and the field clerks together. It has been necessary to separate them; so now we provide for clerks for the staff as we did before, with an increase in numbers, and then we provide for general field clerks that cover those from the staff for the field, and those from the Quartermaster's Department for the field, and so forth.

Mr. OVERMAN. If these are outside of Washington, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. WARREN. They are to go outside of Washington.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know that in the legislative bill we provided for the clerks here in Washington.

Mr. WARREN. These are entirely in addition to those. The Senator has very properly raised the question about the legislative bill, but they are very distinct. These are the only clerks we have provided for in the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee, for a little light on one question in connection with the legislation affecting the headquarters clerks, at the bottom of page 16? I notice that these clerks under this legislation, which is new, "shall be subject to the Rules and Articles of War." Do I infer from that that they are enlisted men?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that a good many of these are men who were formerly employees, but have enlisted under the reorganization of the Quartermaster's Department under a law which was passed some three or four or more years ago. I understand they will all be under arrangements which allow the enforcement of the Articles of War if they obtain the benefits bestowed by this section, which gives them allowance for quarters, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 22, after the word "service," to strike out "\$22,000" and insert "\$26,000," so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Inspector General's Department," on page 17, line 24, after the words "Inspector General's Department," to strike out "\$59,000" and insert "\$69,500," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers of the Inspector General's Department, \$69,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 26, after the word "service," to strike out "\$16,000" and insert "\$17,500," so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$17,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers," on page 18, line 2, after the words "Corps of Engineers," to strike out "\$592,700" and insert "\$725,000," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of officers of the Corps of Engineers, \$725,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 4, after the word "service," to strike out "\$120,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department," on page 18, line 6, after the words "Ordnance Department," to strike out "\$253,600" and insert "\$280,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers of the Ordnance Department, \$280,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 8, after the word "service," to strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$60,000," so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps," on page 18, line 10, after the words "Quartermaster Corps," to strike out "\$655,400" and insert "\$746,900: *Provided*, That details to the Quartermaster Corps of the Army under the provisions of the act approved February 2, 1901, may be made from the Army at large from the grades in which vacancies to be filled by detail exist in said corps, or from the next lower grades, and officers detailed to fill such vacancies below the grade of major in said corps shall again be eligible for detail therein after having served for at least one year in the branches of the service in which such officers shall, respectively, hold commissions: *Provided further*, That officers serving by detail in said corps shall take rank in their respective grades from the dates of their rank under their original detail in said grades: *Provided further*, That the two preceding provisos shall expire by limitation on June 30, 1917: *Provided further*, That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Charles P. Daly, chief clerk, office of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, a military storekeeper in the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain, mounted; and the grade of military storekeeper is hereby revived in the Army of the United States for this purpose only: *Provided further*, That hereafter the provisions of section 1191 of the Revised Statutes of the United States may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be waived in the cases of officers of the Quartermaster Corps who are not accountable for public funds or public property," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers of the Quartermaster Corps, \$746,900: *Provided*, That details to the Quartermaster Corps of the Army under the provisions of the act approved February 2, 1901, may be made from the Army at large from the grades in which vacancies to be filled by detail exist in said corps, or from the next lower grades, and officers detailed to fill such vacancies in grades above that of captain in said corps may be detailed or redetailed therein without a compulsory period of service outside thereof. Officers so detailed to fill vacancies below the grade of major in said corps shall again be eligible for detail therein after having served for at least one year in the branches of the service in which such officers shall, respectively, hold commissions: *Provided further*, That officers serving by detail in said corps shall take rank in their respective grades from the dates of their rank under their original detail in said grades: *Provided further*, That the two preceding provisos shall expire by limitation on June 30, 1917: *Provided further*, That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Charles P. Daly, chief clerk, office of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, a military storekeeper in the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain, mounted; and the grade of military storekeeper is hereby revived in the Army of the United States for this purpose only: *Provided further*, That hereafter the provisions of section 1191 of the Revised Statutes of the United States may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be waived in the cases of officers of the Quartermaster Corps who are not accountable for public funds or public property.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, why is this one man provided for in general legislation?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this one man, Mr. Daly, was for many years chief clerk of the Quartermaster's Department. He, in a way, has filled two positions. He is a very valuable man. This legislation gives him a less pay than he had before, but gives him the position, and, of course, in the long run will

give him the retirement privilege. He has served something like 25 or 30 years already. I will say that very numerous recommendations came to the committee, and in fact came to the House, and the matter was offered on the floor of the House by Mr. HAY, but it went out on a point of order. The communications on the subject are very voluminous, and show that the appreciation of the man and his acquirements is general, I might say universal, not only with the employees that work under him, but with all of the officers over him with whom he has served.

Mr. OVERMAN. In other words, this legislation is for the purpose of putting a clerk in the Army, and allowing him to retire at a certain age.

Mr. WARREN. It follows what has been done in some other very exceptional cases—the case of Tweedale, as the Senator will remember, and some others.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know it has been done.

Mr. WARREN. It is entirely a personal matter, but it is one that appeals very strongly to everyone who knows the circumstances, because of the excellence of this man, who has given his life to this work.

Mr. OVERMAN. Are there not many other excellent people up there who ought to be put into the Army and given the right to retire? I do not know the man. I know nothing about him, except that I know this provision is for the purpose of putting him in the Army by law.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that this man is nothing to me, and was nothing to anyone on the committee. We only considered the case strictly on its merits.

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, I know the Senator is not personally interested in the matter.

Mr. WARREN. But he has been of very great service to the Army at large. There is no doubt that he has saved millions of dollars, in his time, by his efficiency and faithfulness.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no doubt he is a faithful man.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is personal legislation; there is not any question about that. Gen. Aleshire came down personally and expressed a desire to have it done on account of this man's efficiency.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not going to object to it; but I think, being personal legislation, that it is bad legislation. It is taking one man out of the clerks in the office and putting him in the Army, and by legislation allowing him to retire at a certain age and get full pay, or three-quarters pay.

I do not know why we should not do that as to every good man up there. I do not know why we should select one man and put him in this position.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that the parallel would hardly be accurate with anyone who has served heretofore, because of this man's peculiarly valuable service. Not only the Quartermaster General, but all others who have knowledge of his work, are in favor of this.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is bad legislation, as the Senator knows.

Mr. WARREN. I admit, as the Senator says, that it is personal legislation, and in that respect it leads in the wrong direction; but it is one of those cases that are exceptional, and the committee thought it best to put it in.

Mr. OVERMAN. And it is bad legislation in addition because it is a precedent for some other man to say: "You did this for Mr. Daly; now do it for me." These poor clerks in the other departments, who are just as good and just as faithful and just as honest as he is, are not given this privilege. I am not going to make a point of order against it, but I do protest against such legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 16, after the word "service," to strike out "\$160,000" and insert "\$222,375," so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$222,375.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department," on page 19, line 18, after the words "Medical Department," to strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$1,930,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers of the Medical Department, \$1,930,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judge Advocate General's Department," on page 20, line 6, after the word "Department," to strike out "\$47,500" and insert "\$60,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers in the Judge Advocate General's Department, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 22, to strike out:

For paying the expenses of clerical hire and printing and other expenses incident to the making of the revision and codification herein directed, such sum as may be necessary, not to exceed \$5,000, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary therefor.

And insert:

For paying the expenses of clerical hire and printing and other expenses incident to the making of the revision and codification herein directed, not to exceed \$5,000, to be expended upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Signal Corps," on page 21, line 10, after the words "Signal Corps," to strike out "\$319,650" and insert "\$415,200," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers of the Signal Corps, \$415,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 12, to insert:

For pay of 30 aviators, Signal Corps, at \$1,800 each per annum, \$54,000.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, in the case of the item just passed, pay of officers of the Signal Corps, \$319,650, is the provision as it passed the House. The Senate raised it nearly \$100,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that I explained a while ago, when the Senator was not in the Chamber, that many of the increases are accounted for in this way: When the House passed this bill the Army reorganization act had not passed, making changes in all these corps.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will understand, of course, that this covers increase in the Aviation Corps. That is included.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That corps has been increased. Many of them have been increased. The House did not have the increase, and had no estimates on them.

Mr. STONE. There is an amendment just below—

Mr. WARREN. The Senator alludes to the 30 citizen assistant aviators that are provided, in addition to the officers of the Army, to give some encouragement to the young men who apply for places. This authorizes the employment of not to exceed the number of 30, at the rate of \$1,800 a year, and their discharge when they are no longer needed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Retired officers," on page 21, line 21, after "\$2,700,000," to insert: "Provided, That when by reason of the movement of troops a post is temporarily left without its regular garrison and with no commissioned officers except of the Medical Reserve Corps on duty thereat, the Secretary of War may assign a retired officer of the Army, with his consent, to active duty in charge of such post. The officer so assigned shall perform the duties of commanding officer and also any necessary staff duties at such post, and shall, while in the performance of such duties, receive the full pay and allowances of his grade, subject to the limitations imposed by the act of March 2, 1905, and the act of June 12, 1906," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers on the retired list and for officers who may be placed thereon during the current year, \$2,700,000: *Provided*, That when by reason of the movement of troops a post is temporarily left without its regular garrison and with no commissioned officer except of the Medical Reserve Corps on duty thereat, the Secretary of War may assign a retired officer of the Army, with his consent, to active duty in charge of such post. The officer so assigned shall perform the duties of commanding officer and also any necessary staff duties at such post, and shall, while in the performance of such duties, receive the full pay and allowances of his grade, subject to the limitations imposed by the act of March 2, 1905, and the act of June 12, 1906.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 12, to insert:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Col. James Jackson, United States Army (retired), to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I expect that that amendment ought to go over. There is a Senator who wishes to be here when it is considered. It will be remembered that this was in a bill which was on the calendar, and it was called on the calendar three times, and failed to pass.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that that bill did pass the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Did it finally pass?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Oh, yes. It passed the Senate, and is in the House. This one passed the Senate. A Senator objected to it, but withdrew his objection.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know it was called three times; but if it passed the Senate, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 16, to insert:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, any colonel of the Army on the retired list who before retirement served more than 45 years and 6 months, including 16 years in the line of the Army, who held command in the line or staff over 9½ years, who received campaign badges for service in four Indian campaigns and in the War with Spain and the Philippine insurrection, and who was recommended by a commanding general in time of war or insurrection for appointment to the grade of general officer in the Volunteer Army, to the grade of brigadier general on the retired list: *Provided*, That such officer did not receive advanced grade upon retirement nor has since received any advance over the grade held at the date of retirement.

Mr. STONE. Whom is that for?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the amendment just read is one which refers to the case of a single retired officer—Col. James W. Pope—now on the retired list. He is a man of advanced years and in very poor health. He has served more than 45 years and 6 months, including 16 years in the line of the Army. He held command in the line or staff over nine and a half years. He received campaign badges for service in four Indian campaigns and in the War with Spain and the Philippine insurrection. He was recommended by a commanding general in time of war or insurrection for appointment to the grade of general officer in the Volunteer Army—to the grade of brigadier general on the retired list. He is at present a resident of the city of Denver. If he had not been retired on account of age at the time he was retired—that is to say, if he had been a younger man, so that he could have served three months longer—he would have been appointed brigadier general and retired.

Since his retirement Col. Pope has been afflicted with a very serious disease of the eyes, having submitted to, I think, two separate operations, the result being that his private means are practically exhausted. It is a matter of justice to one of the most competent and meritorious officers I ever knew, one who has given his life to the service of the Army, and who, if he should die to-morrow, would leave his widow comparatively dependent upon her people for support. This amendment is merely designed, and I think it is properly designed, to cover him, as a retired officer, into the list of brigadier generals, in consequence of which he can enjoy the advantages which come from that position. Because of the facts I have just narrated it has been necessary to bring the matter to the attention of Congress in this way.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I know something of this case. I think it is a very meritorious case. While it is a practice that perhaps is likely to lead to other similar requests, would the Senator object to amending the provision by naming the officer, so that it would read:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Col. James W. Pope—

And then reciting the service?

Mr. THOMAS. I have no objection to complying with the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. STONE. Can that be done?

Mr. THOMAS. I introduced a bill for that purpose, but it has not yet been reported upon the calendar. In the committee it was thought best to do it in this way.

Mr. CLAPP. I know; but there is criticism, and it seems to me it is warranted, as to taking action of this kind. There has been one such case recently which has been the subject of a good deal of criticism. There are cases where, I think, we are perfectly justified in dealing with them in the way of legislative action.

I believe this is one of them; but I do think it would be better if the man were named, and then if the language were so changed that the balance of it would be a recital of his services.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the Senator is aware that criticisms are made when the name of the individual is given. We have just had an example of that.

Mr. CLAPP. I know; but it can not be said then that something was put through and people did not know what it was. I will not press the matter, but it does seem to me it would be better in all these cases, as in the case just a few moments ago, if the man were named. Then there could be no criticism to the effect that anything was left out.

Mr. THOMAS. I am conscious of the soundness of the criticism that is urged by the Senator to this species of legislation. It does not commend itself to me. Of course, I am aware of the fact that one precedent begets imitation until it

ripens perhaps into a rule. I think, however, in view of the considerations which prompted the preparation of this amendment in the form it now stands, unless the Senator insists upon it—

Mr. CLAPP. I will not insist upon it.

Mr. THOMAS. It should be allowed to remain as it is.

Mr. CLAPP. It might possibly lead to depriving a very meritorious man of what is sought to be conferred by the bill.

Mr. WARREN. May I say to the Senator from Minnesota where we put exact conditions into the act every officer who seeks similar legislation first looks to the language employed and conditions improved. If it applies to a class and he does not come under it, of course he does not approach the committee or Congress for relief; while, on the other hand, nearly every one of the same rank is liable to ask for the same relief, although not of right entitled to it when all the prescribed circumstances are considered.

Mr. CLAPP. I know in one or two instances we have authorized the promotion and recited the circumstances, and no one else could come and ask for the same promotion unless he could bring his case within those circumstances. However, I will not press the matter. I do not care to interfere with the bill in this particular.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 5, to insert:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the grade of major general on the retired list of the Army, with the pay of brigadier general on the retired list, any brigadier general now borne on said list who served with credit in the Army throughout both the Civil War and the War with Spain, as well as during the interval between said wars, and who, being a general officer, exercised with efficiency and gallantry the command of a brigade or of a higher unit in action or in actual operations against an enemy, and who in consideration of services so rendered was recommended to be a major general, United States Volunteers, by the commanding general of the Army, as shown by the records of the War Department: *Provided*, That any brigadier general on the retired list who commanded with credit a brigade or higher unit in the Civil War, though not so recommended, may be advanced in grade as authorized by this act if he fulfills the other requirements thereof.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the amendment be passed over. Those are old familiar faces. I used to be on the Military Committee myself, and we had a pretty good chairman then, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. We had these cases before us time after time, and the committee would never agree to report them favorably.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has not had these particular cases before him. I do not recall that the case of these men was ever before the committee. They receive by this legislation nothing except the title of major general. It does not bring them any compensation whatever. They are men who were general officers in command of troops, brigades, divisions, and so forth, and who did not receive one grade in retirement as did so many of the officers.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand it is just a promotion.

Mr. WARREN. It is the name and nothing more. Every officer below the rank of colonel who served in the Civil War received a promotion of one extra grade upon retirement, and every colonel who was in the Civil War was by the same act many years ago, when retired, made a brigadier general. These men were brigadiers at the time and in command of troops, and hence got no promotion whatever by that law. These brigadiers having had command, perhaps as major general, acting in command of a division, and having been recommended for appointment as major generals of Volunteers, would like this rank; and we state here, if I am not mistaken, in the act itself that there shall be no additional compensation.

Mr. OVERMAN. How old are these men?

Mr. WARREN. They are from 70 to 80-odd years.

Mr. OVERMAN. They are Civil War veterans?

Mr. WARREN. Oh, yes; they were retired at 64 years old some years ago. They were all exceptionally good officers with brilliant records.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know how many men it covers.

Mr. WARREN. It covers four.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the objection to putting the names in the bill?

Mr. WARREN. The same objection that was made a moment ago. Of course the Senator from Minnesota proposes both the names and the reasons.

Mr. OVERMAN. We can not state the reasons.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from North Carolina, who served upon the Committee on Military Affairs, and with great credit to it for a long time and we were most sorry to lose him, knows that to pick up an officer by name and promote him in that way, unless the reason is given in the act, brings us a great many applications from others and brings about a great deal of hard feeling from those who may believe that they are entitled to the same promotion that he receives.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have opposed such legislation for about 10 years; but if the Senator will assure us that it covers only three cases—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Four.

Mr. DU PONT. I can assure the Senator that it covers no more.

Mr. OVERMAN. And there will be no extra allowance or bounty and that these are Civil War veterans I will withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to without objection.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. As many Senators desire an executive session, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) authorizing and directing the Clerk, in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 10484, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," to make certain corrections.

The message also announced that the House further insists upon its amendments to the bill S. 5425, to standardize lime barrels, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. ARERCROMBIE, and Mr. REAVIS managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ADAMSON, Mr. SIMS, and Mr. ESCH managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11240) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KEATING, Mr. VINSON, and Mr. SELLS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12194) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KEATING, Mr. VINSON, and Mr. SELLS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13620) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KEATING, Mr. VINSON, and Mr. SELLS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14576) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KEATING, Mr. VINSON, and Mr. SELLS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of Cascade Local No. 138, International Brotherhood Paper Makers, of Berlin, N. H.;

of Local Branch, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, of Indianapolis, Ind.; and of Local Branch, International Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, of La Fayette, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Josephine Walter, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Local Branch, United Mine Workers of America, of Indianapolis, Ind.; of Local Branch, Granite Cutters' International Association of America, of Quincy, Mass.; of the Public Ownership League of Cook County, Ill.; of Local Union, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Chicago, Ill.; of Local Union, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, of Omaha, Nebr.; and of the Alabama State Federation of Labor, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented telegrams, in the nature of petitions, from sundry citizens of New York City, Niagara Falls, New Brighton, and Port Washington, Long Island, in the State of New York; of Wilmington, Del.; Madison, Wis.; Newport, R. I.; White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.; Baltimore, Md.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; of Roselle, Long Branch, Elizabeth, Summit, Glenridge Depot, and Plainfield, N. J.; and Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES presented a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Clearing House Association of North Yakima, Wash., remonstrating against a tax on banks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Commercial Club and Chamber of Commerce of Tacoma, Wash., remonstrating against a tax on copper, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from D. D. Calkins, of Tacoma, Wash., remonstrating against a tax on copper, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Local Union No. 220, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an increase in the wages of stationary firemen in Federal buildings, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Onondaga County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to found the Government on Christianity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 6688) granting a pension to Henry Ford (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 6689) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Dornsife (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 6690) for the relief of Americus A. Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 6691) granting an increase of pension to John C. Gore (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1528) for the relief of Martin Huhn, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 693) thereon.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Albert Greenlaw (Rept. No. 695);

H. R. 4559. An act for the relief of C. Horatio Scott (Rept. No. 696); and

H. R. 7883. An act for the relief of Charlotte M. Johnston (Rept. No. 694).

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 10) to correct the military record of Clayton H. Adams, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 697) thereon.

Mr. DU PONT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 736) to correct the military record of John P. Webber, alias John J. Webber, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 700) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 6154) for the relief of Dr. Charles Lee Baker, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 698) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 6287) for the relief of Joseph Eubor, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 699) thereon.

Mr. VARDAMAN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11150) for the relief of mail contractors, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 701) thereon.

Mr. PHELAN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 6204) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated," and to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the several States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 702) thereon.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. POMERENE submitted an amendment providing that in computing the length of service of dental surgeons in the Army for promotion, and for other purposes, all such dental surgeons as are eligible who have had service as contract or acting dental surgeons prior to June 3, 1916, shall be given credit under this act for the length of their services as such contract or acting dental surgeons, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 16460), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for repairs to boats, wharves, roads, and replacement at Forts Barrancas, McRee, and Pickens, Fla., and Fort Morgan, Ala., damaged by the hurricane of July 5, 1916, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 16460), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. WORKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 16763) to increase the revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 16763) to increase the revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO.

Mr. BROUSSARD submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INSPECTION OF VESSELS.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13831) to amend section 4464 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to number of passengers to be stated in certificates of inspection of passenger vessels, and section 4465 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, prescribing penalty for carrying excessive number of passengers on passenger vessels, and section 4466 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to special permits for excursions on passenger steamers, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PAY FOR COMPOSITORS.

Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 6626) to fix the rate of pay for compositors and bookbinders in the Government Printing Office, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—LAURA L. NOYES.

On motion of Mr. BRANDEGEE, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of the bill (S. 6183) granting a pension to Laura L. Noyes (62d Cong., 2d sess.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11240) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. POINDEXTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12194) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. POINDEXTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14576) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. POINDEXTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13620) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. POINDEXTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on July 20, 1916, approved and signed the following joint resolution:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that immediately after the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow I shall ask the Senate to dispose of the amendments to the Federal reserve act.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to give a notice, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire the notice read?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not ask to have it read; I desire to have it printed, and I can state in just a moment, if it is important that the Senate shall be advised of it, the purpose of the proposed amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is as it pleases the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us have it read, Mr. President.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I can state it in one minute, I think.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all right.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. When the Army reorganization bill passed the Senate it changed the law with respect to enlistments not only in the Regular Army but in the National Guard. The law theretofore, as affecting the age limit, had provided that no person under 21 years of age should be enlisted in the Regular Army or in the National Guard without the consent of the parent or guardian of such person. The law was changed by the military reorganization bill so that now boys a little over 18 years of age may be enlisted without and against the consent of their parents in the Regular Army or in the National Guard. I propose to reenact two sections in the Army reorganization bill to make them conform to the law as it was previously. That is the only respect, however, in which they are changed. It would require too much time to read the whole notice, and I thought I could merely make this brief statement and the Senate would understand the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he does not know that the changes to which he refers are in strict conformity with the existing law in respect to enlistments in the Navy? That was all that was done in the Army reorganization bill. It made enlistments in the service, so far as age is concerned, in the Army exactly the same as the conditions which obtain in the Navy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. I am aware of that, Mr. President, and it was a matter of oversight with me that I did not offer such a notice and secure the opportunity at least on the naval appropriation bill to change the age limit with respect to the Navy as I think it ought to be changed with regard to the Army. The notice given by Mr. LA FOLLETTE is as follows:

On Saturday, July 22, or as soon thereafter as possible, I shall move to suspend that provision of paragraph 3 of Senate Rule XVI prohibiting any amendment proposing general legislation to any general appropriation bill for the purpose of offering the following amendment to the bill (H. R. 16460) making appropriations for the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, by adding at the end of the bill after line 3, page 154, the following:

"SEC. —. That section 27 of the act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 2, 1916, be amended so as to read:

"SEC. 27. Enlistments in the Regular Army: On and after the 1st day of November, 1916, all enlistments in the Regular Army shall be for a term of seven years, the first three years to be in the active service with the organizations of which those enlisted form a part and, except as otherwise provided herein, the last four years in the Regular Army Reserve hereinafter provided for: *Provided*, That at the expiration of three years' continuous service with such organizations, either under a first or any subsequent enlistment, any soldier may be reenlisted for another period of seven years, as above provided for, in which event he shall receive his final discharge from his prior enlistment: *Provided further*, That after the expiration of one year's honorable service any enlisted man serving within the continental limits of the United States whose company, troop, battery, or detachment commander shall report him as proficient and sufficiently trained may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be furloughed to the Regular Army Reserve under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, but no man furloughed to the reserve shall be eligible to reenlist in the service until the expiration of his term of seven years: *Provided further*, That in all enlistments hereafter accomplished under the provisions of this act three years shall be counted as an enlistment period in computing continuous-service pay: *Provided further*, That any noncommissioned officer discharged with an excellent character shall be permitted, at the expiration of three years in the active service, to reenlist in the organization from which discharged with the rank and grade held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within 20 days after the date of such discharge: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted or mustered into the military service of the United States without the written consent of his parents or guardians: *Provided, however*, That such minor has such parents or guardians entitled to his custody and control, and this proviso shall be applicable to all minors enlisted or mustered into the military service of the United States on and after June 3, 1916: *And provided further*, That the President is authorized in his discretion to utilize the services of postmasters of the second, third, and fourth classes in procuring the enlistment of recruits for the Army, and for each recruit accepted for enlistment in the Army the postmaster procuring his enlistment shall receive the sum of \$5.

"In addition to military training, soldiers while in the active service shall hereafter be given the opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations. Civilian teachers may be employed to aid the Army officers in giving such instruction, and part of this instruction may consist of vocational education, either in agriculture or the mechanic arts. The Secretary of War, with the approval of the President, shall prescribe rules and regulations for conducting the instruction herein provided for, and the Secretary of War shall have the power at all times to suspend, increase,

or decrease the amount of such instruction offered as may in his judgment be consistent with the requirements of military instruction and service of the soldiers."

"SEC. 2. That section 58 of an act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, be, and the same is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 58. Composition of the National Guard: The National Guard shall consist of the regularly enlisted militia between the ages of 18 and 45 years, organized, armed, and equipped as hereinafter provided, and of commissioned officers between the ages of 21 and 64 years: *Provided*, That no person under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted or mustered into the military service of the United States without the written consent of his parents or guardians: *Provided*, That such minor has such parents or guardians entitled to his custody and control; and this provision shall be applicable to all minors mustered into the military service of the United States on and after June 3, 1916."

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, July 22, 1916, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 21 (legislative day of July 19), 1916.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Abram I. Elkus, of New York, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey, vice Henry Morgenthau, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

Col. John W. Ruckman, Coast Artillery Corps, to be brigadier general with rank from July 20, 1916, vice Brig. Gen. John P. Wisser, retired from active service July 19, 1916.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 14, 1916.

Tunis Cline Quick, of Virginia.
James Coleman Motley, of Virginia.
Lewis Jay Rosenthal, of Maryland.
Thomas Butler Anderson, of California.
Caleb William Sommerville, of Pennsylvania.
Charles Franklin Mitchell, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph Howard Cloud, of Pennsylvania.
Johnston MacLeod, of New York.
Norman Edwin Titus, of New York.
John Baker Carson, of Pennsylvania.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Walter A. Bethel, judge advocate, to be judge advocate with the rank of lieutenant colonel from July 1, 1916, to fill an original vacancy.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1916, to fill original vacancies.

First Lieut. Jerome G. Pillow, Fourth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Ralph N. Hayden, Third Cavalry.
First Lieut. Leonard W. Prunty, Fourth Cavalry.
First Lieut. E. Kearsley Sterling, Third Cavalry.
First Lieut. Charles J. Naylor, Fourth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Kerr T. Riggs, Fourth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Carl H. Müller, Eleventh Cavalry.
First Lieut. John A. Pearson, Eleventh Cavalry.
First Lieut. Charles Burnett, First Cavalry.
First Lieut. Daniel D. Gregory, Fifth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Walter H. Smith, Seventh Cavalry.
First Lieut. George H. Baird, Thirteenth Cavalry.
First Lieut. William M. Cooley, Sixth Cavalry.
First Lieut. William G. Meade, Second Cavalry.
First Lieut. William N. Haskell, Cavalry, unassigned.
First Lieut. Henry A. Meyer, jr., Tenth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Frank Keller, Sixth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Guy Kent, Ninth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Copley Enos, First Cavalry.
First Lieut. Emory J. Pike, Eighth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Williams S. Martin, Fourth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Frederick Mears, Cavalry, unassigned.
First Lieut. Alden M. Graham, Eleventh Cavalry.
First Lieut. Robert L. Collins, Eighth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Irvin L. Hunsaker, Eleventh Cavalry.
First Lieut. Clifton R. Norton, Fourteenth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Eugene J. Ely, Fifth Cavalry.
First Lieut. Charles R. Mayo, detailed in the Signal Corps.
First Lieut. Arthur J. Lynch, Fourteenth Cavalry.

First Lieut. Rawson Warren, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. John H. Read, jr., Third Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Joseph H. Barnard, Fifth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Rodman Butler, Eighth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Clarence Lininger, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Edward M. Offley, Twelfth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. John Cocke, Eighth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. John T. Donnelly, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Edwin L. Cox, Eleventh Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Ronald E. Fisher, Ninth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. C. Emery Hathaway, Seventh Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Joseph V. Kuznick, Twelfth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Edward R. Coppock, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. Peter J. Hennessey, Seventh Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Kenyon A. Joyce, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. Howard C. Tatum, detailed in the Signal Corps.
 First Lieut. Arthur G. Fisher, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. George Grunert, Third Cavalry.
 First Lieut. William R. Pope, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Olney Place, detailed in the Signal Corps.
 First Lieut. Thomas H. Cunningham, Fifth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Sidney D. Maize, Twelfth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Ralph M. Parker, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. John H. Howard, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. Matt C. Bristol, Third Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Horace N. Munro, First Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Thomas P. Bernard, First Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Daniel D. Tompkins, Eighth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Clarence A. Dougherty, First Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Isaac S. Martin, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. George R. Somerville, Third Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Seth W. Cook, Eleventh Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Thomas B. Esty, First Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Milton G. Holliday, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. Robert R. Love, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. William H. Bell, Twelfth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Walter H. Neill, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Edmund A. Buchanan, Second Cavalry.
 First Lieut. David L. Roscoe, First Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Edward A. Keyes, Sixth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. John G. Winter, Fifth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Herbert E. Mann, Fifth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Orlando G. Palmer, Sixth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Francis A. Ruggles, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. Henry T. Bull, Fifth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Howard R. Smalley, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. Talbot Smith, Twelfth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Frank E. Davis, Fifth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. William W. Overton, Eighth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Thomas A. Rothwell, Fourth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. E. R. Warner McCabe, Fifth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. James B. Henry, jr., Fifteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Emmet R. Harris, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. John C. Pegram, Tenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Harry L. Hodges, First Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Victor S. Foster, Eighth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Oscar Foley, Third Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Frederick D. Griffith, jr., Sixth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Albert B. Dockery, Tenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Henry E. Mitchell, Seventh Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Edmund L. Zane, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Charles McH. Eby, Eleventh Cavalry.
 First Lieut. William H. Cowles, Eighth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Leon R. Partridge, Third Cavalry.
 First Lieut. William A. McCain, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. John K. Herr, Fourth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Philip H. Sheridan, Fifth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Joseph F. Taulbee, Second Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Andrew W. Smith, Seventh Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Troup Miller, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. William W. Edwards, Twelfth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. John A. Barry, Second Cavalry.
 First Lieut. William W. Gordon, First Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Harold B. Johnson, Third Cavalry.
 First Lieut. James P. Castleman, Thirteenth Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Albert H. Mueller, Cavalry, unassigned.
 First Lieut. Allan F. McLean, Second Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Herman S. Dilworth, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. John V. Spring, jr., Third Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Norman H. Davis, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Charles Telford, Eighth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Levi G. Brown, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Olan C. Aleshire, Twelfth Cavalry.

First Lieut. Emil P. Laurson, Eleventh Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Frederick E. Shnyder, detailed in the Ordnance Department.

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1916, to fill casual vacancies.

First Lieut. Thomas F. Van Natta, jr., Sixth Cavalry, vice Capt. Kirby Walker, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. James A. Mars, Sixth Cavalry, vice Capt. Claude B. Swezey, First Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. James A. Shannon, Eleventh Cavalry, vice Capt. Julian R. Lindsey, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Allan M. Pope, Cavalry, unassigned, vice Capt. Edmund M. Leary, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. John C. Montgomery, Fourteenth Cavalry, vice Capt. Julius T. Conrad, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Dorsey R. Rodney, Seventh Cavalry, vice Capt. Howard R. Hickok, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Alexander M. Milton, Fifth Cavalry, vice Capt. Samuel B. Arnold, First Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Hugh S. Johnson, First Cavalry, vice Capt. Samuel McP. Rutherford, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Carl Boyd, Third Cavalry, vice Capt. George W. Kirkpatrick, Eighth Cavalry, promoted, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Stephen W. Winfree, Fifteenth Cavalry, vice Capt. Cornelius C. Smith, unassigned, promoted.
 First Lieut. Ephraim F. Graham, Cavalry, unassigned, vice Capt. Joseph E. Cusack, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. George E. Nelson, Ninth Cavalry, vice Capt. Lincoln C. Andrews, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Thomas L. Sherburne, Fifth Cavalry, vice Capt. William R. Smedberg, jr., Second Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Emil Engel, Seventh Cavalry, vice Capt. John M. Morgan, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Emmett Addis, Tenth Cavalry, vice Capt. Andrew E. Williams, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Harry L. King, Twelfth Cavalry, vice Capt. Walter C. Babcock, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Arthur G. Hixson, Fourteenth Cavalry, vice Capt. Herbert B. Crosby, First Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Vaughn W. Cooper, Eighth Cavalry, vice Capt. Benjamin B. Hyer, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. David H. Scott, Fifth Cavalry, vice Capt. Mathew C. Smith, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Robert M. Campbell, Seventh Cavalry, vice Capt. Harry H. Pattison, First Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. George V. Strong, Sixth Cavalry, vice Capt. George F. Hamilton, Second Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. George B. Hunter, Thirteenth Cavalry, vice Capt. William H. Paine, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Stanley Koch, Sixth Cavalry, vice Capt. John W. Craig, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Stephen C. Reynolds, Third Cavalry, vice Capt. Hugh D. Berkeley, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. William V. Carter, Cavalry, unassigned, vice Capt. Hamilton S. Hawkins, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Henry C. Pratt, First Cavalry, vice Capt. Frank Parker, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Charles B. Amory, jr., Cavalry, unassigned, vice Capt. George Vidmer, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Kinzie B. Edmunds, detailed in the Signal Corps, vice Capt. Casper H. Conrad, jr., Eighth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Charles S. Hoyt, Eleventh Cavalry, vice Capt. Nathan K. Averill, unassigned, promoted.
 First Lieut. James J. O'Hara, Fifteenth Cavalry, vice Capt. Harry La T. Cavanaugh, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Albert C. Wimberly, Seventh Cavalry, vice Capt. Mortimer O. Bigelow, First Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Roy W. Holderness, Sixth Cavalry, vice Capt. William G. Sills, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. James S. Greene, Tenth Cavalry, vice Capt. August C. Nissen, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Gerald C. Brant, Ninth Cavalry, vice Capt. James S. Parker, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Innis P. Swift, Second Cavalry, vice Capt. Joseph S. Herron, Second Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Arthur H. Wilson, Ninth Cavalry, vice Capt. George B. Pritchard, jr., Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. William C. F. Nicholson, Seventh Cavalry, vice Capt. Alvord Van P. Anderson, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. George Dillman, Sixth Cavalry, vice Capt. Le Roy Eltinge, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.
 First Lieut. Philip J. R. Kiehl, Fourth Cavalry, vice Capt. George W. Moses, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles L. Scott, Fifteenth Cavalry, vice Capt. Frank P. Lahm, detailed in the Signal Corps.

First Lieut. James H. Dickey, Eighth Cavalry, vice Capt. Charles R. Mayo, detailed in the Signal Corps.

First Lieut. Ralph Talbot, jr., Fifteenth Cavalry, vice Capt. Frederick E. Shnyder, detailed in the Ordnance Department.

To be first lieutenants from July 1, 1916, to fill original vacancies.

Second Lieut. Chester P. Mills, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Edwin R. Van Deusen, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Francis R. Hunter, Second Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Guy W. McClelland, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John C. F. Tillson, jr., Tenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Paul C. Raborg, Seventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Edgar W. Taulbee, Twelfth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Dwight K. Shurtleff, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harry D. Chamberlin, Fifth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John J. Waterman, Second Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John Millikin, Fifth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Jack W. Heard, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Charles M. Haverkamp, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Guy W. Chipman, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Edgar W. Burr, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John A. Roberson, Thirteenth Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Joseph P. Aleshire, Sixth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harding Polk, Eleventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Claud K. Rhinehardt, First Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Everett Collins, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Cushman Hartwell, Eighth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Horace T. Aplington, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Alexander D. Surles, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Philip J. Kieffer, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Karl S. Bradford, Cavalry, unassigned.
 Second Lieut. Frederick Gilbreath, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harrison H. C. Richards, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Arthur B. Conard, Tenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John P. Lucas, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Wilfrid M. Blunt, Eleventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. James C. R. Schwenck, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. William P. J. O'Neill, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Thomas J. J. Christian, First Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Frank L. Van Horn, Third Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Howell M. Estes, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. William B. McLaurin, First Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John F. Wall, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Leo G. Heffernan, Fifth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Edwin N. Hardy, Eighth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. George H. Brett, Second Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Robert C. Brady, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Herbert E. Taylor, Sixth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. William M. Grimes, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Henry J. M. Smith, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Malcolm Wheeler-Nicholson, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Alexander R. Cocke, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Alexander L. P. Johnson, Second Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Dexter C. Rumsey, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Henry L. C. Jones, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Edwin O'Connor, Sixth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Eugene A. Lohman, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth P. Lord, Eleventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Edward A. Millar, jr., Fifth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Clyde J. McConkey, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harold C. Lutz, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John M. Thompson, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Daniel E. Murphy, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Kenna G. Eastham, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. James P. Yancey, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Leopold J. H. Herwig, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Raymond E. McQuillin, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. De Forest W. Morton, Eighth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Francis C. V. Crowley, Fifth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. George E. A. Reinburg, Seventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Clarence D. Lang, Twelfth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Philip Coldwell, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. William H. W. Youngs, Fifth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Byron Q. Jones, detailed in the Aviation Section, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. Robert McG. Littlejohn, Eighth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harry A. Flint, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Pearl L. Thomas, Twelfth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Sidney V. Bingham, Seventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Isaac Spalding, Eighth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Henry L. Flynn, Twelfth Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Robert F. Hyatt, First Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harold M. Rayner, Third Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Stephen M. Walmsley, Sixth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John T. McLane, Twelfth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. James S. Mooney, Twelfth Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Henry W. Harms, detailed in the Aviation Section, Signal Corps.

Second Lieut. John E. Lewis, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John D. Kelly, Twelfth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Thorne Denel, jr., Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. William Nalle, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Roy O. Henry, Twelfth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. William E. Dorman, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John C. Prince, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Lindsley D. Beach, Thirteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Carl P. Dick, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John K. Boles, Ninth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Terry de la M. Allen, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John C. McDonnell, Eleventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Jerome W. Howe, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Otto Wagner, Tenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Burton Y. Read, Eleventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Russell B. Patterson, Twelfth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Clyde V. Simpson, Twelfth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Joseph F. Richmond, Tenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Roy S. Brown, detailed in Aviation Section, Signal Corps.

Second Lieut. Louis A. Falligant, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Herbert M. Ostroski, First Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Paul R. Davison, Third Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John B. Brooks, detailed in Aviation Section, Signal Corps.

Second Lieut. John B. Coulter, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. William A. Raborg, Eighth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Welton M. Modisette, Eighth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John P. Wheeler, Fifth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harold M. Clark, First Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Clarence F. Ellefson, Third Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harold Thompson, Fifth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Richard B. Barnitz, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Allen G. Thurman, Eleventh Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. George W. Sliney, First Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Eugene T. Spencer, First Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Willis D. Crittenberger, Third Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Alfred B. Johnson, Third Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Falkner Heard, Fourteenth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Roland L. Gaugler, Fourth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Stuart W. Cramer, jr., Eighth Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Thoburn K. Brown, Seventh Cavalry.

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1916, to fill casual vacancies.

Second Lieut. Geoffrey Keyes, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Jerome G. Pillow, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Joseph W. Viner, Eleventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Ralph N. Hayden, Third Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. John A. Considine, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Leonard W. Prunty, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Earl L. Canady, detailed in the Aviation Section, Signal Corps, vice First Lieut. E. Kearsley Sterling, Third Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. George E. Lovell, jr., Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Charles J. Naylor, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Desmore O. Nelson, Second Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Kerr T. Riggs, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Carlyle H. Wash, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Carl H. Müller, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Paul D. Carlisle, Fifth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. John A. Pearson, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. John F. Crutcher, Eleventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Charles Burnett, First Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Ray W. Barker, Tenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Daniel D. Gregory, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Henry Abbey, jr., Tenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Walter H. Smith, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Earl H. Coyle, Thirteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. George H. Baird, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Mack Garr, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. William M. Cooley, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Stanley C. Drake, Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. William G. Meade, Second Cavalry, promoted.
 Second Lieut. Maxwell Kirby, Third Cavalry, vice First Lieut. William N. Haskell, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edmund P. Duval, Second Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Henry A. Meyer, jr., Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert E. Carmody, Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Frank Keller, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Albert J. Myer, jr., Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Guy Kent, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert O. Annin, Eighth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Copley Enos, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Daniel G. Morrisett, Twelfth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Emory J. Pike, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ralph Hospital, Thirteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Williams S. Martin, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Theodore Barnes, jr., Eighth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Frederick Mears, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Casey H. Hayes, Twelfth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Alden M. Graham, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harvey B. S. Burwell, Thirteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Robert L. Collins, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Roger S. B. Hartz, Eighth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Irvin L. Hunsaker, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles B. Hazeltine, Fourteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Clifton R. Norton, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Eugene M. Owen, Fourth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Eugene J. Ely, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Arthur D. Newman, Third Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Arthur J. Lynch, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John W. Butts, Third Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Rawson Warren, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward L. N. Glass, Third Cavalry, vice First Lieut. John H. Read, jr., Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Foster, Second Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Joseph H. Barnard, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Cuyler L. Clark, Eleventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Rodman Butler, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Clarence C. Benson, Thirteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Clarence Lininger, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas H. Rees, jr., Eighth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Edward M. Offley, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John H. Woodberry, Fifteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. John Cocks, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Walter W. Wynne, Twelfth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. John T. Donnelly, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William A. Robertson, Eleventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Edwin L. Cox, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph B. Treat, Fifth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Ronald E. Fisher, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph W. Byron, Fifth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. C. Emery Hathaway, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Warren P. Jernigan, Eleventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Joseph V. Kuznik, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Sylvester D. Downs, jr., Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. William R. Coppock, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert D. McDonald, Eighth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Peter J. Hennessey, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Orlando Ward, Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Kenyon A. Joyce, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. William O. Ryan, Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Howard C. Tatum, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Benjamin F. Hoge, Tenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Arthur G. Fisher, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frederick Herr, Fourteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. George Grunert, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John B. Thompson, First Cavalry, vice First Lieut. William R. Pope, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John Kennard, Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Olney Place, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Stafford LeR. Irwin, Eleventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Thomas H. Cunningham, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Pearson Menoher, Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Sidney D. Maize, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edwin B. Lyon, Seventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Ralph M. Parker, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Carl C. Bank, First Cavalry, vice First Lieut. John H. Howard, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. George H. Peabody, Third Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Matt C. Bristol, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Earl L. Naiden, First Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Horace N. Munro, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Henry McE. Pendleton, Second Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Thomas P. Bernard, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edmund de T. Ellis, Second Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Daniel D. Tompkins, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert W. Strong, Second Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Clarence A. Dougherty, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Clifford B. King, Fifth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Isaac S. Martin, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Paul R. Frank, Second Cavalry, vice First Lieut. George R. Somerville, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William S. T. Halcomb, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Seth W. Cook, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward C. McGuire, Third Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Thomas B. Esty, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John McD. Thompson, Fifth Cavalry, subject to examination required by law, vice First Lieut. Milton G. Holli-day, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. John F. Davis, Third Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Robert R. Love, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Reese M. Howell, First Cavalry, vice First Lieut. William H. Bell, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Henry J. F. Miller, Eleventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Walter H. Neill, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harry A. Harvey, First Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Edmund A. Buchanan, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frank D. McGee, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. David L. Roscoe, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harry B. Anderson, Fourteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Edward A. Keyes, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Norman J. Boots, Tenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. John G. Winter, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Hugh P. Avent, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Herbert E. Mann, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Victor V. Taylor, Eleventh Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Orlando G. Palmer, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Horace Stringfellow, jr., Thirteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Francis A. Ruggles, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. Leo A. Walton, Tenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Henry T. Bull, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ralph P. Cousins, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Howard R. Smalley, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. John F. Stevens, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Talbot Smith, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Blackburn Hall, Fourteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Frank E. Davis, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward J. Dwan, Fourteenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. William W. Overton, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Eustis L. Hubbard, Tenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Thomas A. Rothwell, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William B. Peebles, Tenth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. E. R. Warner McCabe, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frederic W. Boye, Fifth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. James B. Henry, jr., Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Karl H. Gorman, Sixth Cavalry, vice First Lieut. Emmet R. Harris, unassigned, promoted.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Samuel Reber, Signal Corps, to be colonel from July 1, 1916, to fill an original vacancy, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Charles McK. Saltzman, Signal Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from July 1, 1916, vice Lieut. Col. Samuel Reber, promoted.

Capt. Charles S. Wallace, Signal Corps, to be major from July 1, 1916, vice Maj. Charles McK. Saltzman, promoted.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claudius R. Hyatt to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 17th day of January, 1916.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John S. Barleon to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 27th day of May, 1916.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1916:

Elmer L. Woodside,

Roy J. Wilson,

Carl E. Hoard,

Thomas M. Shock,

Kenneth R. R. Wallace,

William I. Causey, jr.,

Norman C. Gillette,

Lloyd R. Gray,

Walter O. Henry,

William L. Wright,

John Le V. Hill,

John L. Hall,

Laurence T. Du Bose,

Harry R. Gellerstedt,

Charles J. Parrish,

Samuel N. Moore,

Leman L. Babbitt,

Edmund S. McCawley,

Langdon D. Pickering, and

Leonard R. Agrell.

Asst. Surg. Cline H. Dragoo to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 4th day of November, 1915.

Robert F. Barber, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 11th day of July, 1916.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the dates set opposite their names:

James A. Halpin, District of Columbia, July 17, 1916.

William D. Heaton, Nebraska, July 17, 1916.

Aubrey M. Larsen, Utah, July 17, 1916.

Lincoln Humphreys, Arkansas, July 17, 1916.

Theo E. Cox, Ohio, July 17, 1916.

Arthur W. Hoaglund, Minnesota, July 17, 1916.

Carroll H. Francis, New Jersey, July 17, 1916.

Harold L. Jensen, California, July 17, 1916.

Asst. Paymaster Frederick C. Bowerfind to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1914.

Asst. Paymaster Ernest H. Barber to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 22d day of August, 1915.

Pay Clerk Frederick Scherberger, jr., to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 26th day of January, 1916.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Hubbard H. Abbott, of Monte Vista, Colo., to be register of the land office at Del Norte, Colo., vice James A. Kelly, resigned.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William O'Leary, of Minot, N. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Minot, N. Dak., vice Victor A. Corbett, term expired.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Elizabeth Clar to be postmaster at Guerneville, Cal., in place of Elizabeth Clar. Office became presidential July 1, 1916.

CONNECTICUT.

Willis Hodge to be postmaster at South Glastonbury, Conn., in place of Adelbert W. Crane, resigned.

GEORGIA.

George F. Flanders to be postmaster at Swainsboro, Ga., in place of George F. Flanders. Incumbent's commission expires August 23, 1916.

D. W. Folsom to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ga., in place of Daniel E. McRae. Incumbent's commission expires August 9, 1916.

HAWAII.

Beatrice E. Ely to be postmaster at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, in place of Beatrice E. Ely. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

IDAHO.

Hugh H. Hamilton to be postmaster at New Plymouth, Idaho, in place of H. H. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1916.

ILLINOIS.

Merr L. Abbott to be postmaster at Sheridan, Ill., in place of John Morahn, deceased.

Leslie C. Hamilton to be postmaster at Manito, Ill., in place of R. H. Hilling. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1916.

IOWA.

George W. Blair to be postmaster at Lamoni, Iowa, in place of Daniel Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

Albert Neal to be postmaster at Clarksville, Iowa, in place of Edward Madigan. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1916.

E. T. Wall to be postmaster at Osceola, Iowa, in place of Wallace G. Agnew. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1914.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William B. Kelly to be postmaster at Ware, Mass., in place of P. R. Bridgman. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

James R. Mansfield to be postmaster at Haydenville, Mass., in place of Alfred G. Cone. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

James H. Walsh to be postmaster at Leominster, Mass., in place of Frank I. Pierson, removed.

MICHIGAN.

John S. Mills to be postmaster at Holly, Mich., in place of William P. Hicks, deceased.

MINNESOTA.

R. S. Cowie to be postmaster at Rothsay, Minn., in place of T. O. Juvrud. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

MISSOURI.

James F. Ball, to be postmaster at Montgomery City, Mo., in place of J. J. Sleight. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1916.

George T. Bell to be postmaster at Bucklin, Mo., in place of W. G. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expires August 20, 1916.

NEBRASKA.

H. T. Wilson to be postmaster at Stella, Nebr., in place of J. H. Overman. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1916.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Oscar Duncan to be postmaster at Alton, N. H., in place of W. C. Varney. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1916.

NEW JERSEY.

George F. Stabel to be postmaster at Palisade, N. J., in place of George F. Stabel. Office became presidential July 1, 1916.

NEW YORK.

Edwin G. Brown to be postmaster at Minetto, N. Y., in place of Lena J. Chase. Office became presidential July 1, 1916.

Edward Grunert to be postmaster at Croghan, N. Y., in place of Edward J. Monroe. Incumbent's commission expires August 9, 1916.

William H. Hickey to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, N. Y., in place of William G. Davry. Incumbent's commission expires August 24, 1916.

John J. Mattison to be postmaster at Canandaigua, N. Y., in place of John Raines, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

OKLAHOMA.

H. H. Brooks to be postmaster at Luther, Okla., in place of Ira F. Baird. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1916.

Joseph Garland to be postmaster at Frederick, Okla., in place of Donald B. Munro. Incumbent's commission expires August 16, 1916.

H. A. Garrett to be postmaster at Wakita, Okla., in place of W. H. Staggers. Incumbent's commission expires August 12, 1916.

Bessie Hall to be postmaster at Tyrone, Okla., in place of Bessie Hall. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Alexander S. Guffey to be postmaster at Pittsburgh, Pa., in place of George W. McNell, removed.

John B. Oehrl to be postmaster at Monongahela, Pa., in place of D. C. Parkinson. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1916.

John C. Miller to be postmaster at Halifax, Pa., in place of H. S. Noblet. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1916.

S. S. Staples to be postmaster at White Haven, Pa., in place of Pearl T. Feist. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1915.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Nora O'Donnell to be postmaster at Ramona, S. Dak., in place of Nora O'Donnell. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

VIRGINIA.

John T. Cochran to be postmaster at The Plains, Va., in place of Gabriella R. Cochran, resigned.

J. E. Everette to be postmaster at North Emporia, Va., in place of Roger G. Dyson. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1916.

Samuel J. Horne to be postmaster at Coeburn, Va., in place of John H. Steele. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1916.

J. Harry Leebrick to be postmaster at Elkton, Va., in place of H. B. C. Gentry. Incumbent's commission expires August 10, 1916.

WISCONSIN.

H. E. Austin to be postmaster at Boscobel, Wis., in place of G. C. Seemann. Incumbent's commission expires July 23, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21 (legislative day of July 19), 1916.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY.

Abram I. Elkus to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Turkey.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Frank O'Connor to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

W. L. Hoover, England.

CALIFORNIA.

Frank A. Chapman, McFarland.

FLORIDA.

W. L. Straub, St. Petersburg.

IOWA.

R. C. Morse, Belmond.

KANSAS.

Nancy M. McKechnie, Pawnee Rock.

KENTUCKY.

Thomas Mimms, Guthrie.

MARYLAND.

Arthur H. Uhler, Reisterstown.

MINNESOTA.

C. F. Callahan, Foley.

E. J. McGuigan, Winnebago.

Peter H. McNally, Chokio.

Byron J. Mosier, Stillwater.

N. P. Seivert, Mazeppa.

John Svedberg, Aitken.

MISSISSIPPI.

Iona G. Chapman, Utica.

MISSOURI.

George B. Anderson, Garden City.

James Coday, Mansfield.

Walter N. Watkins, Appleton City.

NEBRASKA.

Charles S. Anderson, Fullerton.

C. B. Nichols, Valley.

Patrick F. Leonard, Anselmo.

Gilbert E. Swanson, Oshkosh.

William L. Ulrich, Stuart.

NEW JERSEY.

Thomas E. Ludlam, Sea Isle City.

OHIO.

Thomas A. Duckworth, Johnstown.

OKLAHOMA.

James D. Kivlehen, Edmond.

Roy M. Mobley, New Wilson.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William Alexander, Chambersburg.

Hugh A. Brown, Leetsdale.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

J. A. Zink, Wessington Springs.

VERMONT.

Fred H. Pierce, Orleans.

VIRGINIA.

J. H. Cecil, Dublin.

WASHINGTON.

Lula M. Craft, McCleary.

Lydia M. Rouls, Everson.

WISCONSIN.

Henry Fleishbein, Glidden.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, July 21, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal Spirit, God our heavenly Father, who hast made us a little less than divine, look down, we beseech Thee, upon us from the heights of purity, truth, justice, mercy, love, and good will and awaken those attributes in our souls that we may indeed become God like in thought and deed, and thus fulfill the longings, hopes, and aspirations of our better nature. And Thine be the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 18, 1916, was read and approved.

Mr. WEBB, Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, Mr. ADAMSON, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CLARK of Florida, and Mr. VINSON rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the able and exhaustive opinion of Judge Leonard H. Hand, of the United States district court for the southern district of New York, in the habeas corpus case of H. Snowden Marshall, in which Judge Hand remands Mr. Marshall to the custody of the Sergeant at Arms and directs him to be brought before the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] asks unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the opinion of Judge Hand, of the district court for the southern district of New York, remanding H. Snowden Marshall to the Sergeant at Arms. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10484) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 5425) to standardize lime barrels asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the said amendments, and had appointed Mr. CLAPP, Mr. SHIELDS, and Mr. BANKHEAD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution providing that the Congress of the United States shall participate in the celebration of the "golden wedding" of the first transcontinental lines of railway in the United States;

S. 4654. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 2530. An act for the relief of the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co.;

S. 4287. An act to grant unsurveyed islands to the State of Minnesota for forestry purposes;

S. 793. An act modifying and amending the act providing for the disposal of the surplus unallotted lands within the Black-foot Indian Reservation;

S. 1807. An act to reinstate Elwin Carlton Taylor as a passed assistant surgeon in the United States Navy;

S. 4761. An act providing for the classification, appraised, and disposal of certain lands within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 5914. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 3776. An act providing for the establishment of a radio station at Unga Island, Alaska;

S. 790. An act to repeal an act entitled "An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of May 1, 1888, and extend the provisions of section 2301 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to certain lands in the State of Montana embraced within the provisions of said act, and for other purposes";

S. 782. An act granting additional rights to settlers on reclamation projects;

S. 5976. An act to amend an act approved May 29, 1908, entitled "An act to amend an act to authorize the Baltimore & Washington Transit Co., of Maryland, to enter the District of Columbia," approved June 8, 1896;

S. 5525. An act to provide for the abandonment of Piney Branch Road between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., in the District of Columbia;

S. 5539. An act to consolidate national forest lands;

S. 2701. An act for the relief of William Walters;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of the heirs of Antoine Bayard;

S. 778. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Glacier National Park in the Rocky Mountains south of the international boundary line in the State of Montana, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1910;

S. 453. An act to place Lieut. Col. Junius L. Powell on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier general;

S. 2880. An act for the relief of Martin V. Farmer;

S. 4473. An act for the relief of Charles G. Griffla;